THE
CHRONOLOGY OF THE EARLY TAMILS

Based on the Synchronistic Tables of their Kings, Chieftains and Poets appearing in the Sangam Literature.

BY

K. N. SIVARAJA PILLAI, B.A.,

SENIOR LECTURER IN TAMIL, UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS.

UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS

1932

Price Rs. 5 Foreign 7s. 6d

PREFACE.

Since the work now presented to the reader rests solely on the strength of the Synchronistic Table accompanying it, I consider it necessary to prefix a few remarks bearing on the undertaking and execution of such a work, remarks for which I have not been able to find a place in the body of the book itself.

The History of the Tamils, their language, and their literature cannot be said to have even started its existence, for the sufficient reason that a correct chronological frame-work to hold together and in right order the many facts enshrined in their ancient Sangam Literature has not yet been got at. Various have been the attempts made till now to utilize the facts gathered from that Literature for edifying narratives, descriptions and exhortations; but a genuine history, none of these, it must be regretfully acknowledged, has been able to evolve. Lacking the indispensable initial time-frame, the so-called histories of Tamil Literature and the long-winded introductions to the various editions of the Tamil Classical poems remain to this day inane and vapid of real instruction, in spite of their tedious parrot-like repetitions of fictions and facts culled from tradition and the poems themselves. The learned authors of these dissertations have been only trying to make bricks without straw, or rather to raise a structure with only bricks without the connecting mortar of Chronology. This lack of a scientific chronology is, however, due not to any paucity of relevant materials in which the Sangam Literature is apparently rich but to a failure to apply to them the correct mode of manipulation—their valuation and arrangement. Taking this view of the matter I nerved myself to the task of testing whether the early poems of the

Tamils when subjected to modern methods could be made to yield the secret of their chronology or should be allowed to lie mute, as of yore, or worse still, to mumble out their incoherencies, here and there, in the triad of collections to which a late literary but unhistorical systematist has so kindly consigned them. In entering on this new and difficult piece of work I had no reason to be buoyed up by any strong hope of success, so divergent and even conflicting being the views of scholars about the Tamil Sangam and its Literature and so hopelessly disarranged the literary remains. And immediately after I sat down and began preparing the Synchronistic Table a revered scholar, with another friend, one day happened to step into my room and, learning what I was engaged in, lost no time in throwing a plentiful douche of cold water on the scheme, urging that he himself had been engaged more than once in a similar undertaking but each time had to give it up as a fruitless venture in sheer vexation of spirit. This warning coming from a scholar of his standing and that at the very threshold of my efforts naturally had the effect of very nearly wiping out even the little hope I had behind the back of my mind. Still realising the traditional overpartiality of some of our scholars for traditions as a class I persuaded myself that the scholar referred to must have weighted his barque with a little too much of unnecessary traditional lumber to have thus sent it to the bottom before reaching its destination. A ray of hope thus gleamed through this idea and accordingly I persisted in my work and went on verifying the various literary references and jotting down the names for the projected Table. If past failures are but stepping-stones to future success, I thought that this particular scholar's discomfiture should put me doubly on my guard against the intrusion of legendary matter and unverified traditions amongst the facts of the Table and so vitiating their positive testimony. I resolved also to keep clear before my mind the distinction between facts and our interpretation of facts, between

objective data and subjective constructions. Despite all these resolves, however, I should confess that my first Table, true to the forewarning I had already received, turned out badly; nor could the second fare any better, though much superior to its predecessor in its close-jointed character and freedom from extraneous and irrelevant matter. The Table herewith presented is the result of my third attempt and I trust that the sacrifice of two of its fellows has added strength to it. Unlike its predecessors this Table has stood all the criticism I have been able to bring to bear upon it and hence on this frame I proceeded to distribute the various facts and events of Early Tamil Literature and weave a connected narrative for the period covered by it. Now that the Table and its interpretation are placed before Tamil Scholars, old and new, it is for them to pronounce whether these lay the foundation-stone for a real 'Beginning of South Indian History' based on the earliest literary documents available in Tamil, or, these too should go the way of the previous attempts in the field.

For drawing up the preliminary lists of the Kings, Chieftains and Poets appearing in the Sangam Literature on which the construction of the Synchronistic Table was started, I have to express my thanks to Vidvan V. Venkatarajalu Reddiyar and Pandit E. V. Anantarama Aiyar, then Fellows of the Oriental Research Institute, of whom the latter unhappily has since been removed by the hand of death beyond the reach of this deserved though belated recognition of his assistance. I should also acknowledge with gratitude the services of Mr. S. Somasundara Desikar of the Tamil Lexicon Office and Mr. K. N. Kuppuswami Aiyangar, B.A., of the Oriental Research Institute Office, in so kindly undertaking the preparation of an Index of Names for this book. And, above all, my most sincere thanks are due to the Syndicate of the University I have now the honour to serve, for the facilities and conveniences offered for Research in this Institute without which a work of this nature would scarcely be possible.

CONTENTS.

SECTIONS.

PART I.—*Sangam Literature: Its Valuation and Arrangement.*

SECTION.		PAGE.
1.	Introduction	1
2.	Dravidian Pre-history and South India	5
3.	The historical period of Dravidian Culture and South India	6
4.	Tamil Literature and its historical value ..	11
5.	Early Tamil Literature, the only evidence for the period covered by it	14
6.	The Sangam Literature of the Tamils	15
7.	The Sangam Literature: Its defects and drawbacks.	16
8.	The Story of the Sangam examined	18
9.	The Sangam works: their collection and arrangement	27
10.	The testimony of the Four Collections—Primary ..	38
11.	The Result of the Literary valuation of the Sangam Works	40
12.	Succession of the Sangam Works: their broad arrangement in time	42
13.	The basic Works for the Synchronistic Tables ..	44

PART II.—*The Synchronistic Tables and their Ten Generations* .. 47

14.	Difficulties in our way	47
15.	The Personages in the Tables	51
16.	Description of the Tables	52
17.	The Tables and the Chōḻa line of kings ..	56
18.	A new view-point	60
	The First Generation: Veḷiyan Tittan Period ..	67
19.	The Chōḻa Line: Veḷiyan Tittan	67
20.	The Pāṇḍiya line unrepresented	72

SECTION.		PAGE.
21.	The Chēra line unrepresented	73
22.	The Chieftains	73
	The Second Generation: Tittan Veḷiyan alias *Pōrvaikkō Perunaṟkiḷḷi Period*	75
23.	The Chōḷa Line: Tittan Veḷiyan *alias* Pōrvaikkō Perunaṟkiḷḷi	75
24.	The Pāṇḍiya and the Chēra Kings	81
	The Third Generation: Muḍittalai-Kō Perunaṟkiḷḷi Period	85
25.	The Chōḷa Line:	
	(1) Muḍīttalai-Ko-Perunaṟkiḷḷi	
	(2) Karikālan I	85
26.	The Pāṇḍiya Line: Neḍumtēr Ceḷiyan *alias* Neḍumceḷiyan I	98
27.	The Chēra Line:	
	(1) Antuvan Chēral Irumpoṟai	
	(2) Udiyan Chēral *alias* Perumchoṟṟu Udiyan Chēralātan	103
28.	The Chiefs	105
29.	Link-names	109
	The Fourth Generation: Vel-pah-taḍakkai-Peruviṟal Kiḷḷi Period	111
30.	The Chōḷa Line: Vel-pah-taḍakkai-Peruviṟal Kiḷḷi.	111
31.	The Pāṇḍiya Line: Pūtappāṇḍiyan	112
32.	The Chēra Line:	
	(1) Celva-Kaḍuṅkō-Āli Ātan	
	(2) Kuḍakkō-Neḍumchēralātan	
	(3) Pal-Yānai-Cel-Keḷu-Kuṭṭuvan	116
33.	The Chieftains	118
	Link-names	119
	The Fifth Generation: Uruva-pah-tēr-Iḷañcēḍ Cenni Period	119
34.	The Chōḷa Line: Uruva-pah-tēr-Iḷañcēḍ Cenni ..	119
35.	The Pāṇḍiya Line: Pasumpūṇ Pāṇḍiyan ..	120
36.	The Chēra Line:	
	(1) Kuṭṭuvan Irumpoṟai	
	(2) Kaḷaṅkāykkaṇṇi Nārmuḍi-Chēral	
	(3) Kaḍal-piṟakkōṭṭiya-Vēl-Keḷu Kuṭṭuvan ..	124

SECTION. PAGE.

37. The Chieftains 125

Link-names 128

The Sixth Generation: Karikālan the Great's Period. 128

38. The Chōḷa Line: Karikālan II 128

39. The Pāṇḍiya Line: Palsālai Mudukuḍumi Peruvaḻudi. 131

40. Some Doubts 133

41. The Chēra Line:

(1) Chēramān Kuḍakkō Iḷanchēral Irumporai

(2) Āḍukōṭpāṭṭu Chēralātan 136

42. The Chiefs 140

Link-names 141

The Seventh Generation: Cēḍcenni-Nalamkiḷḷi Period. 141

43. The Chōḷa Line: Cēḍcenni Nalamkiḷḷi 141

44. The Pāṇḍiya Line: Talaiyālaṅkānattu-Ceru-Venṛa Neḍunceḻiyan 144

45. The Chēra Line: Chēramān Kuṭṭuvan Kōdai .. 146

46. The Chiefs 146

Link-names 147

The Eighth Generation: Kuḷamuṛṛattu-tuñciya-Kiḷḷi Vaḷavan Period 148

47. The Chōḷa Line: Kuḷamuṛṛattu-tuñciya-Kiḷḷi Vaḷavan 148

48. The Pāṇḍiya Line:

(1) Ilavantikaippaḷḷi-tuñciya-Nanmāran

(2) Kūḍākārattu-tuñciya-Māran Vaḻudi .. 149

49. The Chēra Line: Yānaikkaṇ Māntaran Chēral Irumporai 149

50. The Chiefs 150

Link-names 150

The Ninth Generation: Rājasūyam-Vēṭṭa-Perunaṛkiḷḷi Period 150

51. The Chōḷa Line: Rājasūyam Vēṭṭa Perunaṛkiḷḷi .. 150

52. The Pāṇḍiya Line:

(1) Musiṟi Muṟṟiya Ceḻiyan

(2) Ukkira Peruvaḻudi 151

53. The Chēra Line:

(1) Chēramān Māri Vaṇkō

SECTION.		PAGE.
	(2) Chēramān Kō Kōdai Mārpan	153
54.	The Chieftains	153
	Link-names	155
	The Tenth Generation: Chōlan Kō-Ceṅkaṇṇan Period	155
55.	The Chōla Line: Kō Ceṅkaṇṇan	155
56.	The Pāṇḍiya Line	156
57.	The Chēra Line: Kaṇaikkāl Irumporai ..	157
58.	The Chiefs	157
59.	Retrospect and Summary	158
	PART III.—*Chronology: The Probable Date of the Ten Generations* ..	160
60.	Preliminary	160
61.	Relative Chronology of the Ten Generations *inter se*	160
62.	The Absolute Chronology of the Generations ..	161
63.	The Testimony of the Early Greek and Roman writers	162
64.	The Āayi Kings and their Kingdom	167
65.	The Conquest of the Āayi country	170
66.	Certain considerations *re* this Chronology ..	170
67.	Confirmatory Evidence	172
	(*a*) Political	172
68.	(*b*) Geographical	174
69.	(*c*) Commercial	179
70.	(*d*) Numismatic	183
71.	Two types of Investigators	186
72.	Previous Attempts	189
	PART IV.—*Results* ..	191
73.	Preliminary	191
74.	(i) Relative Chronology	191
75.	(ii) Absolute Chronology	192
76.	(iii) The Establishment of the Tamil Kingships in their respective capitals	192
77.	(iv) The Ruin of the earlier independent Chieftaincies	195

SECTION. PAGE.

78. (v) The Beginning of Aryanisation 196
79. (vi) The legendary nature of the Sangam Story .. 196
80. (vii) Lateness of the redaction of the Sangam Works. 198
81. (viii) Light thrown on the Sangam Literature .. 198
82. (*a*) "Ettuttokai" or the Eight Collections .. 199
83. (*b*) "Pattuppāttu" or the Ten Idylls .. 200
84. (*c*) The Eighteen Didactic Works 204
85. (ix) A peep into the previous condition of Tamil Literature and Learning 205
86. (x) Light thrown on Dravidian Polity and Civilization 209
87. Conclusion 215

APPENDICES.

I. The Date of Māṇikkavācagar 217
II. Tolkāppiyam *versus* Agapporuḷ 222
III. The Authorship of Kalittogai 224
IV. Note on 'Ārkkāḍu' and 'Aruvāḷar' 227
V. Note on the Tamil suffix 'Mān'(மான்) .. 229
VI. Note on Karuvūr, the Chēra Capital 231
VII. Note on Poet Iḍaikkāḍar 235
VIII. Grammarians on the significance of மன் and கொல் 237
IX. Note on the Elephant-marked Coins of Madura .. 249
X. Note on the 'Aryas' and 'Vaḍapulam' .. 251
XI. Numismatic evidence *re* the Dark Period in Tamil History 253
XII. Prof. W. F. Clifford on the Authority of Traditions 254
XIII. Note on *Tiruvaḷḷuvamālai* 255
XIV. Note on the name *Tirumurugāṟṟuppaḍai* .. 257
XV. The Age of *Tolkāppiyam* 258
Index 267
Authors and Books consulted 281

TABLES.

1. Genealogy of the Chōḷa Dynasty
2. Genealogy of the Pāṇḍiya Dynasty

		Page.
3.	Genealogy of the Chêra Dynasty	xix
4.	Contemporary Kings of the Early Ândhra Dynasty in Mahârâṣṭra according to Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar	xx
5.	Contemporary Kings of the Early Ândhra Dynasty in Tailangana according to Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar.	xxi
6.	Dates of the Generations	166
7.	Synchronistic Table of the Tamil Kings and Roman Emperors	185
8.	Scheme of Development of the poems in the 'Pattup-pâṭṭu' Collection	201
9.	The Synchronistic Tables of the Kings, Chieftains, and Poets separately printed and kept in the pocket in the hind cover of the book.	

ERRATA.

Page—Line.				
45—30	*for*	naiete	*read*	naivete.
80—31	„	Agam., S. 220	„	Agam., S. 226.
117—12	„	Erythrœan	„	Erythræan.
120— 3	„	naurally	„	naturally.
125—15	„	was	„	way.
170—21	„	Archœological	„	Archæological.
176—26	„	Kuṭṭanâḍu[2]	„	Kuṭṭanâḍu.[4]
231—24	„	Koḍagu	„	Kuḍagu.

TABLE I.

THE CHOLA GENEALOGY.

50 B C -25 B C	(1) Veliyan Tittan, the Conqueror of Uraiyur
25 B C -1 A D	(2) Tittan Veliyan alias Porvaikko Perunarkilli, son of (1).
1 A D -25 A D	(3) Mudittalaikko Perunarkilli, probably son of (2)
	(4) Karikalan I alias Perumpun Cenni
25 A D -50 A D	
	(5) Velpahradakkai Perunarkilli, probably son of (3).
50 A D -75 A D	(6) Uruva-pahrer-Ilanjet-Cenni probably son of Karikalan I.
75 A D -100 A D	(7) Karikalan II or Karikalan the Great, son of (6).
100 A D -125 A D	(8) Cetcenni Nalankilli, probably son of (7)
125 A D -150 A D	(9) Kulamurrattu-tunjiya Killivalavan, probably son of (8).
150 A D -175 A D	(10) Rajasuyam Vetta Perunarkilli, probably son of (9).
175 A D -200 A D.	(11) Cholan Ko-Cenkanan.

C—C

TABLE II.

THE PĀṆḌIYA GENEALOGY.

1 A.D.-25 A.D.	(1) Neḍuṁtēr-Ceḻiyan of Korkai *alias* Neḍuñceḻiyan I, the Conqueror of Kūḍal.
	|
25 A.D.-50 A.D.	(2) Ollaiyūr-tanta-Pūtappāṇḍiyan, probably son of (1).
	|
50 A.D.-75 A.D.	(3) Pasumpūṇ-Pāṇḍiyan *alias* Nīlam-taru-tiruvil-Pāṇḍiyan *alias* Vadimbalamba-ninṟa-Pāṇḍiyan *alias* Pannāḍu-tanta-Pāṇḍiyan or Neḍuñceḻiyan II, the Conqueror of the Āayi country, probably son of (2).
	|
75 A.D.-100 A.D.	(4) Palśālai-Muḍukuḍumi-Peruvaḻudi *alias* Veḷḷiyambalattu-tuñciya-Peruvaḻudi, probably son of (3).
	|
100 A.D.-125 A.D.	(5) Talaiyālaṁkānattu-Ceru-Venṟa-Neḍuñceḻiyan *alias* Neḍuñceḻiyan III, probably son of (4).
	|
125 A.D.-150 A.D.	(6) Ilavantikaipaḷḷi-tuñciya-Nanmāṟan. (7) Kūḍakārattu-tuñciya-Māṟan-Vaḻudi.
	|
150 A.D.-175 A.D.	(8) Musiṟi-Muṟṟiya-Ceḻiyan. (9) Kānappēreyil-tanta-Ukkirapperuvaḻudi.

TABLE III.

THE CHERA GENEALOGY.

25 B.C.-1 A.D.	(1) Karuvūr-Eṟiya-Oḷ-Vāḷ-Kōpperumchēral-Irumporai, the Conqueror of Karuvūr.		
1 A.D.-25 A.D.	(2) Udiyan Chēral probably son of (1).	(3) Antuvan Chēral probably son of (1).	
25 A.D.-50 A.D.	(4) Kudakkō Neduñchēralātan, son of (2).	(5) Palyānai-Cel-Keḷu-Kuṭṭuvan, son of (2).	(6) Celva-Kaḍum-Kō *alias* Chikkaṟ-paḷḷi-tuñciya-Celva-Kadumkō, son of (3).
50 A.D.-75 A.D.	(7) Kaḍal-Piṟakōṭṭiya-Vēl-Keḷu-Kuṭṭuvan, son of (4).	(8) Kalaṁkāy-kaṇṇi-Nārmudi-Chēral, son of (4).	(9) Kuṭṭuvan-Irumporai, the Conqueror of Takaḍūr, son of (6).
75 A.D.-100 A.D.	(10) Āḍukōṭpāṭṭu-Chēralātan, son of (4).		(11) Kuḍakkō-Iḷañchēral-Irumporai, son of (9).
100 A.D.-125 A.D.	(12) Chēramān-Kuṭṭuvan-Kōdai.		
125 A.D.-150 A.D.	(13) Yānaikkaṇ-Cey-Māntaran-Chēral-Irumporai.		
150 A.D.-175 A.D.	(14) Chēramān-Māri-Vaṇko.		
	(15) Chēramān-Kōkkōdai-Mārpan.		
175 A.D.-200 A.D.	(16) Chēramān-Kaṇaikkāl-Irumporai.		

TABLE IV.

The Contemporary Kings of the Early Āndhra Dynasty in Mahārāshtra according to Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar.

50 B.C.-40 B.C.	(1) Krishnaraja.
40 B.C.-16 A.D.	(2) Sātakarni.
	(3) Kṣaharata Nakapana and his son-in-law Vasavadāta.
133 A.D.-154 A.D.	(4) Gotamiputra Sātakarni.
130 A.D.-154 A.D.	(5) Vāsisthiputra Pulumayi.
154 A.D.-172 A.D.	(6) Gotamiputra Sri Yajña Sātakarni.
172 A.D.	(7) Vāsisthiputra Catuṣparna (Cattirapana).
About 190 A.D.	(8) Madhārīputra Sākasena.

(*Early History of the Deccan,* p. 32.)

TABLE V.

The Contemporary Kings of the Early Andhra Dynasty in Tailangana according to Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar.

Date.	*Name.*
A.D.	
154-158	Pulumāyi.
158-165	Siva Sri
165-172	Sivaskanda.
172-202	Jajña Sri.
* * * * *	
202-208	Vijaya.
208-211	Candra Sri.
211-218	Pulomavi.

THE
CHRONOLOGY OF THE EARLY TAMILS
BASED ON
THE SYNCHRONISTIC TABLES OF THEIR KINGS, CHIEFTAINS AND POETS.

PART I.

The Sangam Literature: its Valuation and Arrangement.

Introduction.

1. If the literatures of the other races in India should stand condemned for want of history, the Literature of the Tamils also should allow itself to be arraigned on that common count. Many of these races, it is true, have built up characteristic civilizations of their own in their respective areas, and thus made history in a real sense; but few of them had the taste or inclination to systematically record what they had accomplished in set works devoted to history. The Tamils, who have occupied the Southern corner of Peninsular India from a time beyond the reach of traditions when their migration into the land is said to have taken place, have also evolved therein a social polity and civilization which still possess features entirely distinct from those of the Aryan system of the North. It is further clear that in the long stretch of centuries over which this culture spreads, the Tamils have borrowed freely from others and given them largely of their store in return. When a race meets another and comes to live by its side for centuries, cultural drifts are bound to occur either way, unless a particular race takes deliberately the unwise step of severe isolation from its neighbours. Every historian knows that such an isolation, if persisted in, leads in the long run to decline and decay

and no nation, that has not been brought into contact with an outside race, either by its own migration or that of the other in its midst, could hope to come to the forefront in the cultural history of man. Hence, it is little surprising that in the meeting of the Aryans and the Dravidians in South India a mixture of cultures should have taken place, and that also on no inconsiderable scale, as their contact all the while seems to have been very close and intimate down to the present day. The problem of problems for the historian of Southern India is to take this composite culture, this amalgam of civilization, analyse it carefully and impartially and trace its elements if possible to their respective sources—Dravidian or Aryan.

It is sad to note, however, that in the preliminary efforts towards such an undertaking, the Indian Sanskritists as a class, consciously or unconsciously, have failed to do justice to the Dravidian element in the problem. In fact, the systematic attempt of many of them appears ever to have been to belittle the Dravidian contribution to the cultural history of India and in their treatment of the question to try even to wipe out, if that were possible, the term Dravidian and all that it goes to connote. In no activities of life, either practical or theoretical, have they found anything that could go incontestably to the credit of the Dravidians. Even after the appearance of that epoch-making work of Dr. Caldwell, which covers only a very small and limited corner in the extensive field of Dravidian civilization taken as a whole, scholars are not wanting who have taken upon themselves, in a truly quixotean spirit and manner, to tilt against linguistic windmills of their own creation and to claim thereby a victory of having demolished the claims of the Tamil language to a position independent of the great divine language of the North—Sanskrit.[1] But western

(1) Sanskrit Authors like Kshêmêndra and others, with greater linguistic insight than is displayed by some present-day Indian Sanskritists,

scholarship, as might be expected, wanted to hold the balance even and, in spite of the predisposition and partiality engendered by its equipment in Sanskrit lore, has now begun to feel that the judgment delivered till now has been wholly one-sided and faulty and that common fairness demands that it should be withdrawn till, on the momentous issues raised, the other side also had been allowed to have its say. If I am not mistaken, the first and foremost duty of the Dravidian section of the Oriental Research Institute started by our University is to see whether, in all or any of the sociological phenomena it may have to handle, there is anything ethnic, linguistic, or cultural, which could go under the distinctive appellation, the Dravidian, or whether the whole system is Aryan from top to bottom as some enthusiastic investigators hereabout have begun to assert.

For an attempt at throwing some light on this great problem, it has been more than once pointed out that the gaze of the scholars should be directed to the South. This part of India, ever since the original migration of man, has been the home and centre of Dravidian life and culture and possesses the richest materials, archæological, sociological, linguistic and literary. Except for its pre-historic remains, of which the recent finds of Mohenjo Dāro and Harāppa form probably but a part, North India has been literally swept clean of its Dravidian antiquities by the

have relegated the Drāviḍi or the Dravidian group of languages to the class Paisāchi (the language of the demons) and thereby admitted that this group has no genetic relationship with Sanskrit, the language of the Gods or with any of its allied dialects. The attempt, however, of some modern Indian Sanskritists to prove that Tamil and other related languages are indebted to Sanskrit both for their vocabulary and their accidence, if successful, would only prove that the Dravidian language is only an Aryan tongue in disguise and should never have been given the misnomer 'Paisāchi'. The favourite method, followed by such scholars of catching hold of a few linguistic resemblances and grammatical analogues here and there for raising the widest generalisations on them, if pushed to its utmost extent of application, might probably go to establish the interconnection of all the languages in the world! Imagination, it scarcely needs pointing out, feels dazed before such an attempt, at least in this infant stage of linguistic science.

great Aryan flood. That did not and could not happen in the South. Here, the so-called Aryanisation seems to have assumed a milder form; its mighty waves were splintered into ripples here. But even then it did not fail to spread a somewhat thick scoria of religious colour over the whole face of Dravidian life and spiritual outlook.[1] This was presumably effected by the Aryan alliance with the Kingships raised on the ruins of the ancient Village Communities of Dravidian India and by the use of political power as an engine for engrafting new beliefs and practices on the old stem. Despite this powerful move—for powerful it must have been in a society composed for the most part of peaceful agriculturists, traders and artisans—the tangled skein of the present-day Dravidian life contains many a filament of native purity which awaits the practised eye and the patient labour of the specialist to disentangle and separately exhibit. Thus, South India, both by its rich pre-historic past and by its existing social structure and practices, forms the most characteristic, if not the only, source of real information on Dravidian history, past and present.

Dravidian Pre-history and South India.

2. But strange to say even at this distance of time, when many minor problems facing the Ethnologists have received their adequate exposition and solution, the possibilities of South India in respect

(1) Here is Prof. Whitney's testimony about the life, thought and outlook of the Indian branch of the Aryan race being entirely permeated by religion. He writes: "The mass as it lies before us is almost exclusively of a religious character; this may have its ground partly in the end for which the collections were afterwards made, but is probably in a far higher degree due to the character of the people itself, which thus shows itself to have been at the beginning what it continued to be throughout its whole history, an essentially religious one. For no great people, surely, ever presented the spectacle of a development more predominantly religious; none ever grounded its whole fabric of social and political life more absolutely on a religious basis; none ever meditated more deeply and exclusively on things supernatural; none ever rose, on the one hand, higher into the airy regions of a purely speculative creed, or sank, on the other, deeper into degrading superstitions—the two extremes to which such a tendency naturally leads".—*Oriental and Linguistic Studies*, pp. 5-6.

of the light to be thrown on the Dravidian-Aryan contact, have scarcely been explored in any methodical manner and worked up to lead to positive results. The nature of the problem—the study of the Dravidian civilization in all its original shape and colour—requires that our attention should be centred more on the pre-historic periods than on the brief span of the chequered history of South India in later times. It is well-known that Positive History, which begins with the invention of writing and evolution of literature, is preceded by two great periods, the semi-historic and the pre-historic. And it is equally well-known that for the pre-historic times the historian draws upon the fruitful science of Archæology and for the semi-historic he has to depend on such new sciences as Comparative Philology and Linguistics, Comparative Mythology and Religion, a study of folk-lore, folk-songs, etc., a study of man's arts, industries, professions and institutions, in short all the studies bearing upon man and going under the rather general title "Sociology". The materials to be gathered from such varied special sciences and studies, though they may be seemingly mute yet convey to the historian cryptic messages of their own and furnish him with the links to connect the particular history of a nation with its past and with the general history of mankind at large. My reason for referring to these somewhat patent facts is only to show what a large lee-way South India has still to make in creating this group of special sciences before she can with confidence look for a scientific history of her past. Works in any of these directions, except a few stray monographs, are yet to come and until specialists step in to supply the want, the historian has necessarily to wait. On the past phases of Dravidian pre-history, the views of individual scholars expressed so far will carry conviction only when they are reinforced by the necessary scientific data. And for this, a thorough and systematic exploration of the Dravidian antiquities by a group of specialists in the many fields indicated above

is absolutely necessary. Excavations of the sites of the oldest capitals and ports of the Tamil sovereigns such as Karūr, Musiṟi (Cranganore), Koṟkai, Kūḍal (old Madura), Uṟaiyūr, and Kāvirippaṭṭinam have still not been attempted, though such an undertaking may throw much welcome light on the Dravidian culture prevailing at about the opening centuries of the Christian era.[1] Linguistic, literary and cultural studies from a strictly Dravidian standpoint and on scientific lines have not yet been entered upon to any extent and made to add their quota of evidence. The resources of the epigraphic investigation, which relies mainly on lithic records and copper plate grants of the mediæval kings and some private donors, become exhausted by the seventh or the sixth century A.D.—the utmost reach beyond which its materials grow scanty in the extreme.[2] In circumstances such as these, the earlier stages in the Dravidian history or rather pre-history, which have been indicated above, are bound to remain in the dark for a long time to come.

The Historical Period of Dravidian Culture and South India.

3. Fortunately for the historical period of South India, the Tamils, of all the Dravidian nations, have cultivated and preserved a literature reaching comparatively to a fairly good antiquity. Considering the limited necessities and conditions of the Early Tamils, their literature is apparently rich enough and, what is

(1) Since writing the above, the Archæological Department of Mysore have made certain trial excavations in Chitaldrug District of their State and have succeeded in alighting upon the buried remnants of prehistoric cities of the iron and the stone age near the Brahmagiri Hill and at Siddapura in Molakalmuru Taluk. The history of the ancient culture in South India is thus pushed back many centuries from the Early Mauryan Period.

(2) Dr. Vincent Smith in p. 467 of his *Early History of India*, writes thus: "The eighteen Purāṇas pay small attention to the South, early inscriptions are extremely rare, the coinage gives little help, the publication of Archæological investigations in a finished form is backward, the exploration of the ancient literature is incomplete. On the other hand, from the ninth century onwards the mass of epigraphic material is so enormous as to be unmanageable."

more important and valuable for the historian, it happens to contain a simple and faithful record of the happenings of a far-off period. Even before the historian takes up this body of literature, it is absolutely necessary that it should be judged on grounds of literary chronology and arranged in a scheme exhibiting continuous growth and development. Chronology of language and thought, on which Prof. Max Müller laid much stress, is nothing but history extended beyond its generally accepted province of the civic and political events of a society. No doubt by this extension of the phenomena to be covered and by their peculiar nature the standard of accuracy becomes less definite and precise than in the strictly limited historical field. But with all its loss in comparative definiteness and precision it carries with it an inexpugnable certainty of its own as any fact of orthodox history. In the absence of valuation of literature on principles of literary development based on strictly psychological standards,[1] the historian's handling of that literature would lead but to error and confusion. So I shall first try to approach Tamil Literature from the standpoint of literary development and see whether it is possible to discover in it any principles of the growth of the national mind.

Taking a bird's eye view of the total ensemble of Tamil Literature, we find it is made up of three separate and clearly-defined strata, the *Naturalistic*, the *Ethical*, and the *Religious*.[2] This division proceeds on the most

(1) Lord Morley enforces this truth in the following remark: "That critics of art seek its principles in the wrong place so long as they limit their search to poems, pictures, engravings, statues, and buildings, instead of first arranging the sentiments and faculties in man to which art makes its appeal." *Burke*, p. 19.

(2) Compare with this the stages specified by Mr. P. N. Bose, B.Sc., in his work *Epochs of Civilisation*. "In the first stage matter dominates the spirit, military prowess calls forth the greatest admiration, culture, being relegated to the gratification of the senses, takes the form of the Fine Arts. The second stage is characterised by intellectual development. It is the age of Reason, of Science and Philosophy, and Militarism is on the decline. The third or final stage is the stage of spiritual development." Vide *Modern Review*, 1913, p. 435.

fundamental characteristic of literature at large—its dominant and guiding motive in any historic period. The classification of literature into periods on linguistic, metric, or literary forms, though helpful in its own way, cannot be half so satisfactory for purposes of chronology as the one carried out on the varieties of literary motive that inspires and lights up different periods of a literature. While the literary modes and forms, the garb though they are of thought and expression, may change like fashion, the guiding and sometimes compelling ideals of a literature seem to possess a somewhat greater relative persistence. These form in short the very life and soul of a literature and serve as a faithful index, if not a complete record, of the national mind and its orientation in successive periods of its history. These should therefore serve us as unerring guides in our attempt towards fixing the relative ages of different periods of Tamil literature, at least in its broadest outlines. Judged by the standard of the motive or the ruling idea alone, each of the three groups mentioned above, the Naturalistic, the Ethical, and the Religious, reveals a new turn in the national mind and relates a different story. They mark also three successive periods in the evolution of Tamil literature, in which the national mind is reflected, the Naturalistic being the earliest, the Religious the latest, with a mediating period marked by Ethical thought. In the poems composed during the Naturalistic period, man's life and his surroundings are dealt with in their most elementary phases and the poets, one and all, seem occupied with depicting these in their 'unadorned simplicity'. Man's physical wants and sensuous enjoyments are the only themes which evoke their Muse. As a class the Naturalistic Poets do not anywhere rise much above a 'life of the senses'. In the Ethical Period, however, their horizon gets more widened and they are found to interest themselves in larger problems of man's well-being in an organised society. Here they try to grapple with ques-

tions of conduct and character arising from the various complex relations of life in society and appear generally preoccupied with the evolution of a code of morals and polity to form the basis of an ordered social life. Advancing still further to the last stage, the Religious, the vision of the Poet seems to quit man's earthly existence and his limited interests therein and is turned on a higher and grander sphere, the destiny of his soul beyond time. In this super-sensuous, highly abstracted intellectual ordering, physical life appears almost to dissolve and disappear from view as of little or no account whatsoever.

Though one may feel tempted to justify the orderly succession of such periods in the evolution of the Tamil mind on *a priori* grounds of its natural constitution and the presuppositions of social psychology, I shall confine myself to a consideration of certain broad facts of Dravidian national life and history as lending more than ample justification for the division of literary periods here adopted. Before their contact with the Aryans, the Dravidians, as I have elsewhere pointed out, were mainly engaged in building up a material civilization and securing for themselves the many amenities of life, individual and communal.[1] Naturally, therefore, their lives took on a secular colour and came to be reflected as such in the literature of that period. The impulse of religion, which came to possess them at a later period, was then absent. And when the first infiltration of the Aryans began, the Jains and the Buddhists seem to have been the earlier batch, all facts and traditions considered. These heretical sects, finding in the Tamil land no Brahmanic religion on any scale to oppose, had to content themselves with the composition of works mostly ethical and literary. The Tamils too seem to have taken themselves readily to this impulse which ran in the direction of their national bent, and the second period accordingly was throughout ethical

(1) Vide *Agastya in the Tamil Land*, p. 7 and pp. 18-20.

and literary in substance and tone and seems to have been ushered in by the writing of such works as *Kuṟaḷ, Tolkāppiyam*, etc. The Hindu Aryans, in any force, were the last to come and with their arrival was opened quite a new channel of national activity, Religion, into which the whole of Dravidian life and thought have flowed since, the pioneer in this work being the great Saivite preacher and propagandist, Tiruñānasambandar of the seventh century A.D.[1] Immediately after the dawn of the Religious Epoch, there arose a transition period in which the heretics wrote on Religion and the orthodox Hindu writers, on Ethics; but this late mixture of impulses in the national life need not deflect our vision regarding its broad features and lead us to modify our conception as to the relative ages of the two impulses in the history of the Tamil nation. Thus, by the facts of the social and political history of the Tamil land from the beginning till now, the tripartite classification of its literature, based solely on its dominating motive and ideal, receives its amplest justification. I shall designate these periods as the classical, the mediæval, and the modern, for convenience of reference.

(1) This period synchronises with the Pallava domination over the Tamil kingdoms in the South. The later Pallavas of the Simha-Vishnu line, the builders of the Māmallapuram Monolithic temples, were the real protagonists in the Aryanisation of the South. Aryan religion, under the aegis of the Pallava Kings of Kāñcipuram seems to have gathered a power and prestige all its own, which it had failed to secure during the pre-Pallava period. Wherever political power enters into alliance with a religion, that religion is bound to succeed. Buddhism, after the time of its great founder, throve only so long as it had powerful potentates to back it up; the moment that support was withdrawn, it collapsed. This only illustrates the general truth that independent thought amongst the masses of a society is only a slow growth. These generally look to the top for leading in such speculative matters and then blindly follow. *Apropos* of the Tamil connection with the Pallavas, I may instance an interesting irony of time brought about by change of historic circumstances. At the beginning, the Tamils looked down upon the Pallava race as a 'mixed breed' and in their mouth the term 'Pallava' stood for a person of mean extraction. But after the establishment of the Pallava power in the Tamil land, one of the Dēvāram hymnists, strange to say, goes out of his way to utter imprecations against such of the Tamil Kings as refused to pay tribute to the Pallava overlord.

Tamil Literature and its Historical value.

4. The value of this body of literature for purposes of history should next be appraised. As a necessary preliminary to the treatment of this very important question, one can scarcely overlook the general ban under which Indian Literature as a whole has been placed by the Indian Epigraphists and their oft-repeated stricture that literary evidence, unless and until vouched for by the more reliable evidence from inscriptions and other contemporaneous documents, is not worthy of credence. The grounds for such a condemnation are doubtless many and weighty. Indian Literature, at least of the ancient and mediæval times, sadly lacks any chronological frame-work worth the name; it is tainted with a profuse and indiscriminate intermixture with all sorts of legendary and mythical stuff; and what is more provoking than these to one engaged in the construction of a scientific history of the past is to find the generality of the Indian people exhibiting an uncritical proneness to accept any work of literature as sober history of their past and a tendency to anathematize those who disbelieve or doubt the veracity of that literature. The extreme dictum of the Epigraphist may be due to reasons such as these and in fairness one cannot blame him for being too cautious and critical in separating the wheat from the chaff in that huge promiscuous literary heap.

Still, I cannot but urge that what applies to Indian Literature as a whole is not at all applicable to the Tamil Literature of the earliest period. Setting aside the Ethical as of little value to history, the Religious portion of Tamil Literature, *i.e.*, the later Tamil Literature, has little to distinguish it from the general run of the Aryan Literature of the North and may, therefore, be allowed to lie under the Epigraphical embargo. Their material for the construction of history can in no way be used without the most careful critical examination and even then the

demand for epigraphic corroboration regarding their testimony will not be considered superfluous.

But, as far as the Naturalistic Period of Tamil Literature is concerned, a wholly different treatment should, in my opinion, be accorded. The works, which go into this class, show human mind in the most unsophisticated stage of its growth. The virus of later myths and marvels has not yet entered it and brought about a corruption of its pure fountains.[1] In this connection, I feel bound to demur to the assumption, too commonly and too hastily made by some scholars, that even the earliest stratum of Tamil Literature bears traces of Aryan influence. I can only say that this assumption is entirely gratuitous and is the result of hazy thinking on the subject. As grounds for this conclusion, they invariably appeal to the use of certain Sanskrit words here and there in the poems of that period, to the existence of a few Aryans among the Tamils, and to some of those Aryans appearing as authors of certain poems, in that remote age. Granting the whole of this contention—for, as a matter of fact, in respect of the last two grounds we are far too removed from that early period to be confidently dogmatic about the nationality of the individual settlers and singers of an age long since gone by—still to say that poems like *Kuṟumtokai, Naṟṟiṇai, Aganānūṟu,* and *Puṟanānūṟu* are based on Aryan models or inspired by Aryan ideals, in their plan or execution, is nothing less than a positive perversion of facts. Both in substance and in form, these earliest warblings of the Tamil Muse are native throughout and do not bear the slightest tinge of foreign influence. If, from the appearance of a few words of Sanskrit or Prākrit origin, these poems are

(1) Sir H. S. Maine writes thus in p. 26 of his "*Village Communities*" about Oriental Thought and Literature as a whole: "It is elaborately inaccurate, it is supremely and deliberately careless of all precision in magnitude, number and time". Though this formidable indictment is true of North Indian Literature and later Tamil Literature, it is utterly inapplicable to the specific stratum of Literature taken up for consideration in this work.

divested of their indigenous character, one could, with equal reason, conclude that modern English Literature is inspired by Indian ideals on account of certain Indian words having got into the ever-expanding English Language. Borrowing of words from one language by another is a matter of everyday occurrence and has not the least bearing on the question of influence on literary models and ideals. Further, I am at a loss to conceive how these theorists would dispose of the very large number of poems in the "Sangam" collections which have not even a single Sanskrit word to disturb their native harmony. Do these too reflect Aryan thought and life? To seek to connect then the presence of a few Aryans in the Tamil land at that early period. and the form and thought of early Tamil Literature is most unwarranted and is perhaps due to a proneness to magnify the antiquity and extent of the Aryanisation work in Tamiḻagam. Surely, these early poets of the Tamil land did not wait for the incoming Aryans to be schooled into literature in their native tongue; but, on the other hand, the new arrivals had to pick up the knowledge of what to them was a foreign language and the form and technique of a foreign literary art. The Naturalistic class of Tamil Literature must therefore be considered as containing works exhibiting native Tamil genius in all its purity and integrity with little or nothing of any exotic strain in it. It has not the incrustations of fanciful myths and impossible legends to mar the value of its testimony. It is, for the most part, a plain unvarnished tale of the happenings of a by-gone age wholly free from the stereotyped conventions and profuse embellishments which the erudition and fancy of later times happened to delight in. A Literature, such as this, which transcends the period of Aryan intermixture, that brought in its train all the mythological cargoes[1] of the

(1) Springing equally with Science from the speculative side of man's intellectual powers, the myths, no doubt, form his first attempt at answering certain theoretical problems he himself creates. The practical man, on the other hand, does not encumber himself with a consideration of such

North, should open to us a new treasure-house of facts, a good deal of which can go bodily into history. Hence one cannot be too careful and circumspect to keep this literary patrimony of the ancient Tamils free from the contamination of the wild myths and legends of later times.

Early Tamil Literature, the only evidence for the period covered by it.

5. To another consideration also, the attention of the Epigraphists may be invited in this connection. Even granting that literary evidence, the best of it, can scarcely stand on a par with epigraphic testimony in accuracy and certitude, it is after all the only evidence, all things considered, which South India of the early centuries of the Christian Era may possibly supply us with. Excepting the few rock-cut caves and beds, the so-called Pāṇḍu Kuḻis,[1] and the Brāhmi Epigraphs in the Tinnevelly and Madura Districts and in the Arcot region—and these too have not been satisfactorily deciphered yet—almost the whole body of the inscriptions seems to take its rise from the founding of the stone-temples in the South and from the practice of making gifts for religious purposes to individuals or corporations.[2] If South Indian temples are admittedly off-

questions. The myths may accordingly be held as the science of the primitive man; they may be bad science but still they are science of a sort, being the product of the theoretic activity of his soul. But, however much these myths may have served man's purposes at the time of their origin, they are here condemned for the insidious influences they still exercise on the beliefs and practices of the present day and for delaying the advent of a wholly scientific outlook and method in the thought and activity of modern India.

(1) Mahāmahōpādhyāya Paṇḍit Swāminatha Aiyar in one of his University lectures gives the correct form of this name as Pāṇḍa Kuḻi (literally meaning pottery-pit).

(2) Referring to South Indian inscriptions as a whole, Dr. V. A. Smith writes: "But these records, notwithstanding their abundance, are inferior in interest to the rarer Northern documents by reason of their comparatively recent date. No important Southern inscription earlier than the Christian Era is known, except the Mysore and Maski editions of Asoka's Minor Rock Edicts and the brief dedications of the Bhattiprolu caskets. The records prior to the seventh century after Christ are few." (*Early History of India*, p. 17.)

shoots of the Pallava art of Māmallapuram of the seventh century A.D., one will not be justified in expecting much epigraphic evidence for the earlier centuries. The higher we mount the rarer should they become. To count then on the construction of South Indian History from inscriptions alone, for periods anterior to the century above indicated, is, it seems to me, a hope that will scarcely be realised. Epigraphy thus failing us, we have next to fall back on the only available evidence within our reach—Literature. At least, the Epigraphist can have no objection to accept this repertory of information as the second best instrument of research in a region where we have no reason to expect anything better. Thus, then, early Tamil Literature, from its intrinsic merits and from its extrinsic historical conditions, has a value all its own, which is hardly worth one's while to cavil at.

The Sangam Literature of the Tamils.

6. Before passing on to a consideration of the Naturalistic Group of Tamil Literature and its valuation, a few observations about the larger class, of which this forms a part, are called for. The "Sangam" Literature covers, in its entirety, two of the groups I have indicated above, the Naturalistic and the Ethical. The Naturalistic group consists of the most part of the Eight Anthologies called the *Eṭṭutokai* (literally the eight collections) and by far the greater portion of the "Ten Idylls" known as the *Pattuppāṭṭu.*[1] The

(1) The Eighth Anthologies are: (*i*) *Puṟanāṉūṟu*, (*ii*) *Kuṟum-tokai*, (*iii*) *Naṟṟiṇai*, (*iv*) *Agaṉāṉūṟu*, (*v*) *Patiṟṟuppattu*, (*vi*) *Ainkuṟunūṟu*, (*vii*) *Kalittokai*, and (*viii*) *Paripāḍal*. The Ten Idylls are: (*i*) *Poṟunar-āṟṟuppaḍai*, (*ii*) *Paṭṭinappālai*, (*iii*) *Mullaippāṭṭu*, (*iv*) *Maduraikkāñci*, (*v*) *Neḍunalwāḍai*, (*vi*) *Perumpāṇaṟṟuppaḍai*, (*vii*) *Ciṟupāṇāṟṟuppaḍai*, (*viii*) *Malaipaḍukaḍām*, (*ix*) *Kuṟuncippāṭṭu*, and (*x*) *Tirumurugāṟṟuppaḍai*. Of these, *Parīpāḍal* and *Tirumurugāṟṟuppaḍai*, the last in each of the two collections, are, it seems to me, of late origin bearing as they do evident traces of the religious motive. It is highly probable that they may have been composed towards the close of the Ethical Period. I have purposely deviated from the orthodox order of enumeration to secure a chronological arrangement, the grounds for which will be made clear in the course of this work.

Eighteen Didactic works, in which *Kuṟaḷ* and *Nālaḍiyār* appear, go to form the Ethical catena of the Sangam Literature. Though I propose to confine myself strictly to the Naturalistic portion, I have to utilise also the Ethical to mark off the stages in the History of Tamil Literary development. The historical valuation of the several works may be deferred for the present. The over-anxiety to judge and use historically a mass of literary materials, chaotically thrown together with little or no attempt at even a broad arrangement of their contents in time, will only lead to 'confusion being worse confounded'. Principles of literary growth and development would be thrust to the background, if not completely overlooked, and a system of perverted chronology would be the sole outcome at which literary men and historians of literature would only stand aghast.[1] Valuation of literary materials on principles of development displayed by the national mind is hence an indispensable preliminary before these could be rendered fit for any historical utilisation. And so I shall first try to derive whatever guidance I may from that source.

The Sangam Literature, its defects and drawbacks.

7. The Early Literature of the Tamils, unhappily christened the "Sangam Literature", has had to labour under certain serious difficulties and drawbacks and, on this account, it has not come into its own till now. First and foremost is the atmosphere of myth and mystery in which the whole cycle of poems has been enveloped by a later generation of scholars and scholiasts. In the second place, the various poems have been collected and arranged on principles of pure literary form and theme by a late redactor, probably Perundēvanār, the author of the first Tamil *Mahābhāratam,* in mixed prose and verse, and of the many invocatory stanzas appended to five of the collections. This literary

(1) *Vide* Appendix I: The Date of Māṇikkavācagar.

arrangement has distorted the chronology of the works in the most lamentable manner imaginable. The whole mass has been thus rendered unfit for immediate historical handling. If an evil genius had conceived the plan of playing pranks with the chronology of a nation's early literature and gone to work, it could not have done worse than what the redactor, the Tamil Vyāsa, has himself done. It is a most perverse arrangement to say the least and deserves entire recasting for purposes of history. If the thanks of posterity are due to this Tamil Vyāsa for having rescued these works from extinction, the chaos into which he has thrown them, not conducing to any connected historical account, must lead one to the sad reflection that, after all, ignorance of a particular period of a nation's history would have been far better than the myriad errors and misconceptions his effort at systematisation has since given rise to. In the third place, by far the greater number of scholars who have approached it have not written about it in the proper scientific spirit and with the necessary insight and sympathy. Far be it from me to cast any slur on the few pioneers who turned the first sod in the field of Dravidian research. Still one can hardly help remarking that the "Sangam Literature" has suffered more from its friends than its foes. The scepticism of the latter seems to have been more than counter-balanced by the blind credulity almost amounting to bigotry of the former, who belaud this literature as the very acme of perfection and try to carry back the date of its composition to many thousands of years before the dawn of the Christian Era. The opposite school, not to be outdone in exaggeration, seems to have developed an over-sceptical frame of mind and is equally positive in assigning these works to the eighth or ninth century after Christ, if not lower still ! We need not for the present take sides with either of these parties but proceed at once to see what credence could be given to the story of the Sangam itself.

The Story of the Sangam examined.

8. After all, the story of the Sangam is not very ancient as it looks. When the so-called "Sangam" Poets and Kings lived and accomplished their life-work, the Sangam had not come into existence. Considering the war-like nature of that early period and the unsettled state of political existence then obtaining, the very idea of a literary Academy could not have been anything else than foreign to it. The primitive historical conditions of the Tamil land, as evidenced by the literature of the Naturalistic Period, could not have favoured any such institution coming into existence. The various poems in this collection of works have one and all been composed by different poets, living in different parts of the country, on many different occasions. The literary motive behind their production was by no means the composition of a perfect work of art to stand the scrutiny of a conclave of critics at the top. The hard lot of the poets of that period, faced with the problem of bread and butter, seems to have driven them on to attach themselves to some king or other, some chieftain or other, and play the part of singers of their glories and achievements. Wanting a public to which they could sell their literary wares, the Poets had perforce to depend on the few patrons on whom they lavished their choicest eulogia in return for the food and clothing they were provided with. Presents of elephants and gold ornaments might have come once in their way, and that also only in the case of the singers in the front-rank of their profession; but to the generality of the poets the problem of keeping the wolf from the door, in life's hard struggle, was too imperious to be overlooked. A Poet, with a famishing household behind him, and driven on its account to the presence of his patron, could very well be excused for not keeping to the ideal requirements of his art for the time being. His one idea, naturally enough, would have been to please his patron and win the most valued presents from him and not to court an assembly

of fastidious critics sitting in a far-off city for a verdict on his work—an assembly moreover of scholars equally famished as himself, whose approval or disapproval would not have in the least mattered with him in fighting the battle of life. Thus, even if the Sangam had existed at the time we speak of, it would not have functioned at all. But did it exist?

If contemporary evidence is the only means at our disposal to arrive at any relevant conclusion on this point, it wholly negatives the existence of any such institution as a Sangam. The earliest reference to this hypothetical body occurs in the commentary written on *Iṟaiyanār's Agapporuḷ*, a late work probably of the 8th century A.D. Everything connected with this work is so steeped in myth and mystery that not even the slightest reliance can any one safely place on it. *Agapporuḷ* is decidedly later than *Tolkāppiyam*. In more than fifteen sutras,[1] the phraseology of Tolkāppiyar seems to have been borrowed wholesale with little or no variation. Yet with all these borrowings the author of this famous work on Love appears to have kept himself in the background and allowed his handiwork to lay claim to a divine origin. Nothing less than Revelational authority would satisfy him in the hopeless struggle he appears to have entered upon for displacing the great classic of Tolkāppiyar in the field of Agapporuḷ. Along with this mystery of the authorship of *Agapporuḷ*, there is the added mystery of its commentary which is ascribed to Nakkīrar, one of the Sangam celebrities. In order that this ascription might gain acceptance at the hands of contemporaries then living, the real author of the commentary, probably Nīlakaṇṭan of Musiṟi, pretends that he had Nakkīrar's commentary transmitted to him by word of mouth through ten continuous generations of disciples, intervening between himself and Nakkīrar. How this preposterous story could

(1) *Vide* Appendix II: *Tolkāppiyam versus Agapporuḷ.*

be believed in it is not for us to inquire into just now. All that I want to make out is that both the work, *Iṟaiyanār's Agapporuḷ,* otherwise known as *Kaḷaviyal,* and its commentary, should stand discredited all things considered and that anything they contain should be subjected to the most careful scrutiny and examination before being accepted as historical matter.

And it is in this mysterious work, the mystery of the Sangam tradition, all on a sudden, takes its rise. This tradition is not a genuine one emanating from the people; it bears on its face the hall-mark of a literary workshop from which it has been presumably issued for general circulation; its too minute details about the number of years allotted to each Academy, the number of Kings and of Poets and the names of those Kings and Poets and of the works belonging to each preclude the possibility of the author ever having received such information from any floating tradition current before his time. Beyond doubt, the whole story takes its birth from the fabulising imagination of a late scholar and owes its persistence to the sedulous propagation it received from the uncritical mediæval commentators.

Examining the account of the three Academies a little more closely, we find that the whole structure is too symmetrical, too methodical and artificial, to be true. The facts embodied in the narration of the *Agapporuḷ* commentator, if distributed under their appropriate headings in a table, are enough to tell their own tale. They will undoubtedly bring home to the reader's mind the scheme on which the commentator has worked, in order to leave behind him one of the most daring of literary forgeries ever perpetrated. The incredibly high antiquity with which Tamil Literature comes to be invested by this legend and the high connection with divinity it brings about were more than enough to secure for it a ready acceptance by a credulous public; but to later scholars the tradition stands to this day a sphinx' riddle.

Evidently the fabricator appears to have started from some authentic data before him. They were the so-called "third Sangam" works, which in all probability must have by that time assumed a collected form. These collections furnished the basis on which he proceeded to raise his imaginary structure of the three Sangams. The number of Poets appearing in these collections was too unmanageable for his purpose, exceeding as it did five hundred. He had to make a selection from this large and varied company of poets before investing any with the membership of his projected Academy. Taking the 49 letters of the Sanskrit Alphabet, which, to the orthodox scholar, still represent the Goddess of Learning, he could not have thought of any other number so appropriate as forty-nine to represent the strength of her votaries in the last Tamil Academy. Further, this particular number being of the odd class should have recommended itself to a superstitious mind to which even numbers are a taboo to this day by their inauspiciousness. With forty-nine[1] as the starting point most of the figures in the account appear to have been easily arrived at. The number of the Pāṇḍiyas admitted to the charmed circle of the bards composing the Sangam rises in an arithmetical series as 3, 5, and 7 and the period of duration of the three Sangams put together falls short of ten thousand years by ten.[2] Another notable peculiarity of the arrangement is that the fabricator was determined to see the third Sangam playing the Cinderella to

(1) This number appears again in the 49 Tamil *nāḍus* said to have been submerged in the Indian Ocean; and also in the Vēḷirs' genealogy as 49 generations from their remote ancestors who are believed to have lived in Dvārasamudra.

(2) This distributed among the 197 Pāṇḍiyas of the three Sangams put together gives us an average of fifty and odd years for a generation—an impossible figure in human history. Individual cases of exceptional longevity there may of course be; but in the calculation of an average to cover 197 generations no figure, exceeding 20 to 25 years, can be safely adopted. Human history in any known period does not give proofs of such lengthened averages for a generation.

her elder sisters—the two previous Sangams. So far as the figures go, she should not aspire to any figure higher than the lowest under each heading. Evidently the fabulist worked on the current doctrine of degeneration, whereby the golden age of man was relegated to a far distant time in the past, the succeeding ages getting more and more corrupt in morals and poorer in intellect and learning. Another feature of this cut-and-dried scheme is also worthy of special mention. Though among the five hundred and odd poets the various tribes and professions of ancient Tamiḻagam were strongly represented, the third Academy shows except for a limited sprinkling of a few Kiḻārs and Vaṇigars (merchants) a preponderant Aryan element. What the author, from his superior station, considered the plebeian consitutent of the literary body was carefully kept out of his Academy. Gods, Kings, Rishis, and Aryan Scholars—at least those whom he considered as belonging to that superior class—do seem to have somehow jostled the native scholars to the background. This poverty of the native talent in the literary aristocracy admitted into the Academy should doubtless give us an inkling into the source from which the Sangam myth arose. Moreover, this patrician assembly gives us an entirely wrong perspective of the learned community of the ancient Tamil country.[1] Coming to the Literature prevalent at different Sangam periods and the Grammar on which that literature is still held to have been based—for in the opinion of the father of the

(1) Of the 49 poets of the third Sangam appearing in *Tiruvaḷḷuvamālai*, nearly half is made up of such scholars as Kavi Sāgara Perundēvanār, Rudra Sanma Kaṇṇar, Nalkūr Vēḻviyār, etc., who have not a single stanza to their credit in these collections. Evidently they belonged to a much later age and were brought in to strengthen the Aryan element of the Academy. And in the remaining half, three *Kiḻārs* and three *Vaṇigars* alone have secured admittance. It may be urged whether, in the world of scholarship of which the Academy was representative for that age, racial considerations could be brought in; but somehow that seems to have been the main reason which weighed with the famous fabricator of the Sangam in practically ignoring the native poets.

Sangam,[1] Grammar should necessarily precede Literature—the third Sangam, with its *Paripāḍal* and *Kalittokai*, and other works for its Literature, and *Tolkāppiyam* for its Grammar, was sought to be thrown into the shade by its more illustrious predecessors with such works as *Perumparipāḍal, Peruṅkalittokai* and *Agattiyam*. These imaginary works were created possibly to prick the pride of the arrogant members of the third Academy.[2] Turning next to the places wherein the Academies were successively held, modern Madura was preceded by Kapāḍapuram of the Ramayana fame and one Southern Madura. The name 'Madura' itself was a later coinage even for Uttara Madura, which probably before the period of Talaiyālaṅkānattu-Pāṇḍiyan was known as Kūḍal as probably also Pēralavāyil. This name came into vogue only after the Aryans had secured some influence in the South by their increasing numbers and importance. If Uttara Madura itself had gone by some other name in any past period, the creation of a Southern Madura as an earlier city carries with it its own refutation. The name so far from establishing its antiquity does just the reverse.[3] Existing Literature is wholly silent regarding the last two cities. The story-teller has however thrown out a hint about a deluge between the second and third Academies. Whether a like catas-

(1) *Cf.* "In the first dialogue of the *Eroici Furori*, published at London in 1585, while Bruno was visiting England, he expresses his contempt for the mere pedants who judge poets by the rules of Aristotle's Poetics. His contention is that there are as many sorts of poets as there are human sentiments and ideas, and that poets, so far from being subservient to rules, are themselves really the authors of all critical dogmas. Those who attack the great poets whose works do not accord with the rules of Aristotle are called by Bruno stupid pedants and beasts." (*Spingairn's Literary Criticism in the Renaissance*, p. 166.)

(2) The story of the chastisement administered to that uncompromising critic Nakkīrar, related at some length in *Tiruviḷayāḍal-purāṇam*, is also due to the same motive.

(3) The name 'Madura' has travelled beyond the limits of South India. Yule and Burnell write in their *Hobson-Jobson* "Thus we have Madura in Ceylon; the city and island of Madura adjoining Java; and a town of the same name (Madura) in Burma, not far north of Mandale, Madeya of the Maps".

trophe intervened between the first and the second Sangam we have no means of knowing. Probably the author did not think it safe to appeal to two deluges marking the termination of the first two Academies. Failing a deluge what other cataclysm then could one interpose between the first two Sangams for explaining the shifting of the head-quarters of the Assembly from Southern Madura to Kapāḍapuram? Another interesting problem in connection with these periodic convulsions to which Tamiḻagam was subject is in regard to the means by which such complex details as are found embodied in the tradition reached the hands of the eighth century fabulist. Were they communicated by word of mouth from generation to generation as in the case of the famous commentary on *Iṛaiyanār's Agapporuḷ* or did this great historian come upon some secret archives which had escaped the deluge? It is unnecessary to probe further into this elaborate myth, which proclaims itself as a crude fabrication of the Religious epoch in almost every fibre of its make-up. If any additional testimony were necessary to fortify this conclusion, this one fact, I think, would suffice; that in the first Academy the revered name of Agattiyanār heads the list and stands above even that of God himself! Such was the power of priesthood then and so god-compelling were the mantras of which it was the custodian, that it could with impunity measure strength with Omnipotence itself. No other writer outside the ranks of the priests would have dared performing this heroic feat![1]

I may here summarise the grounds thus far offered to establish the purely legendary character of the Sangam story. (1) The tradition regarding the Sangams is not a popular one but was brought into existence and propa-

(1) This is what A. M. Hocart says in p. 133 of his book *Kingship*: "This probably started in India and was the result of the gradual rise of the King or priest to be a god in himself and not merely the spokesman of a god. We know that the Indian priests carried the divinity of man to such extremes that eventually the priest became superior to the gods from whom he had originally derived all his prestige and authority".

gated by a literary and priestly coterie for purposes of its own; (2) The so-called Sangam works contain absolutely no reference to any Sangam whatever; (3) The political and social conditions of the period reflected in Sangam Literature were not at all favourable for the creation and maintenance of any such Sangam; (4) The facts and figures contained in the tradition are so artificial and symmetrically disposed as to lead but to one conclusion that they cannot be natural and are 'faked' throughout; (5) The constitution of the Sangam containing as it does mythical characters and members drawn disproportionately from the Aryan community shows the lateness of its origin, when the Aryans had come in larger numbers to the Tamil land and begun to introduce the northern myths in the south;[1] (6) The period of duration of the three Academies put together, *viz.*, 9,990 years, if distributed among the 197 Pāṇḍiya Kings will be found to give us an average of fifty and odd years per generation —certainly an impossible figure in the history of man, being more than double the general average which it discloses: (7) One or two deluges intervening, the narrator, in the natural course of events, could not have any authentic source of information as regards at least the first two Sangams and his testimony based on data whose source is still wrapped up in such deep mystery is hardly worthy of acceptance; (8) The late origin of the name 'Madura' for Uttara Madura itself—for it could not be earlier than Talaiyālaṅkānattu-Pāṇḍiyan's time, the city till then going under the name of Kūḍal—shows unmistakably that the Tamils of the first Sangam

(1) How in process of time myths develop is also commented upon by H. Kern in his *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, pp. 5-6. He writes: "In general it may be said that the stock of tradition, common to all Buddhists, increased among the non-orthodox sects by much additional matter. New mythological beings such as Bodhisattvas, Avalōkitēsvara and Manjusri make their appearance; a host of Buddhas of the past, present and future, are honoured and invoked along with Sakyamuni, whose image, however, far from being effaced, is clad in brilliant majesty more than ever." The same has been the case with Hinduism also.

could not have dreamt of such a foreign name for their southern Capital at that far-off period and that the name 'Southern Madura' is thus a pure coinage of the romancer from 'Madura' which he converted into 'Uttara Madura' to lend support to his own story; (9) The non-existence of any of the works of the first or the second Academy raises the presumption that they were more the creations of the romancer's imagination than actual works of real authors, swept away by the deluges which on the whole are but a clumsy attempt at explanation when so many other details regarding the works themselves have come down to us intact; (10) The whole scheme is against the course of natural events and hence is unscientific in its character. History of learning and knowledge in any country at any time must show in the main a gradual progress and development from small beginnings. The Sangam tradition reverses this natural order and shows a continuous decadence from the golden age of the first Academy till we reach the iron age of the third.

Reasons so many and substantial as these should lead any fair-minded scholar to reject the Sangam tradition as entirely apocryphal and not deserving of any serious historical consideration. It will, however, furnish a chapter in the study of myths and the psychological tendencies of the age in which it arose. Though worthless as testifying to any objective facts of Tamil history, the tradition itself claims our notice as a phenomenon of a certain type at a particular period of a nation's thought. I strongly suspect whether the eighth century tradition is not after all a faint reflex of the earlier Sangam movement of the Jains. We have testimony to the fact that one Vajranandi, a Jaina Grammarian and Scholar and the pupil of Dēvanandi Pūjyapāda, an accomplished Jaina Sanskrit Grammarian, in the Kanarese country, of the sixth century A.D., and the author of a grammatical treatise, *'Jainendra'*, one of the eight principal authori-

ties on Sanskrit Grammar, went over to Madura with the object of founding a Sangam there.[1] Of course, that 'Sangam' could not have been anything else than a college of Jain ascetics and scholars engaged in a religious propaganda of their own.[2] This movement must have first brought in the idea of a Sangam to the Tamil country. It is more than likely that, following closely the persecution of the Jains ruthlessly carried out in the seventh century A.D.,[3] the orthodox Hindu party must have tried to put their own house in order and resorted to the creation of Sangams with divinity too playing a part therein, for the express purpose of adding to the authority and dignity of their literature. It was the sacerdotal 'Sangam' of the early Jains that most probably supplied the orthodox party with a cue for the story of a literary Sangam of their own on that model. The very name 'Sangam' unknown to the early Tamils proclaims its late origin and to attempt foisting the idea it signified on the so-called Sangam Literature as its inspiring cause is little short of perpetrating a glaring and absurd anachronism.

The Sangam works: their collection and arrangement.

9. Leaving out of account the Ethical group of the Sangam Literature, the eighteen Didactic works, which are admittedly later compositions, the real Sangam collections embrace the Ten Idylls (*Pattup-pāṭṭu*) and the Eight Collections (*Eṭṭuttokai*), which form the Naturalistic group. Evidently the stanzas or groups of stanzas appearing in these collections belong to different authors, treat of different subjects, sometimes with reference to particular kings or chiefs and sometimes

---

(1) *Vide* E. P. Rice's *Kanarese Literature*, pp. 26-27.

(2) "Samgha, Dr. Buhler (p. 6) acknowledges to be as much a Jain as a Buddhist technical term for their orders or societies" (T. W. Rhys Davids, '*On the Ancient Coins and Measures of Ceylon*', (p. 59). It may here be pointed out that this term refers to one of the Buddhist Triratnas: Buddha, Dharma and Samgha.

(3) "A terrible persecution of the cognate religion Jainism occurred in Southern India in the Seventh Century". (Elliott, *Coins of Southern India*, p. 126 *post*, Ch. 16, Sec. 2).

not. The various poets whose poems have been gathered into these collections can scarcely be considered as belonging to one generation. They must have lived generations apart and left their fugitive works in the custody of some sovereign or chief, whose glories they happened to sing about. At least a goodly part of these collections must have lain snug in the palace archives of some king or other before they were arranged and set in their present order by a late redactor. In which repository these poems lay, who conceived the first idea of arranging them, and who carried out the arrangement, are matters about which we know absolutely nothing at present. Internal evidence there is to the extent that one Bhāratam Pāḍiya Perundēvanār has affixed invocatory stanzas to five at least of the Eight Collections, *viz.*, *Puṟanāṉūṟu*, *Agaṉāṉūṟu*, *Naṟṟiṇai*, *Kuṟuntokai*, and *Aiṅkuṟuṉūṟu.* Of the remaining three, *Patiṟṟuppattu*, (The 'Ten Tens') appears rather in a mutilated form with the first and the tenth 'Ten' missing; *Kalittokai* contains an invocation by one Nallantuvanār, who is reported to be its redactor, but may also have been its author; and in *Paripāḍal*, twenty-four out of the seventy pieces have been published and these bear unmistakable evidence of their very late origin. Literary tradition handed down by fugitive stanzas and allusions in the words of the commentators give us some specific information about the scholars who made some of these collections and the kings by whose orders such works were carried out.

Poem.	Scholar who collected.	King who directed the Collection.
1. *Aiṅkuṟuṉūṟu* ..	Pulatturai Muṟṟiya Kūḍalūr Kiḻār (Kūḍalūr Kiḻār, who was the master of the whole domain of knowledge) ..	Chēra King by name Yānaikkaṇchēy Māntaran Chēral Irumpoṟai.
2. *Kuṟuntokai* ..	Not known ..	Pannāḍutanta Pāṇḍiyan
3. *Naṟṟiṇai* ..	Not known ..	Pūrikkō Māṟan Vaḻuti.
4. *Agaṉāṉūṟu* ..	Uruttira Sanman ..	Pāṇḍiyan Ukkira Peruvaḻudi.
5. *Puṟanāṉūṟu* ..	Not known ..	Not known.

Keeping *Aiṅkuṟunūṟu* apart, a work decidedly later than the others on literary and historical grounds, the last four go together both by their subject-matter and style of composition. The principles that appear to have guided the redactor are the nature of the subject-matter of the compositions, their style of versification, and even their bulk, the number of lines of verse of each stanza furnishing a standard for his classification. If the subject-matter of the literary compositions was distributed wholly under either 'Agam' (Love) or 'Puṟam' (War, Politics and other miscellaneous matters), the first classification from this standpoint must have been effected by one author. It is very unlikely that the various groups of poems existed as such in the archives of different kings; nor is it probable that if they had lain together in the palace library of any one sovereign the other sovereigns, with whose names tradition associates certain compositions, could have in any manner directed such compilations. Even supposing that one particular king was so deeply attached to war that he was pleased to patronise only the *Puṟanāṉūṟu* collection, the triad of 'love' poems, *Kuṟuntokai,* with stanzas containing from four to eight lines, *Naṟṟiṇai,* from 9 to 12 lines, and *Agaṉāṉūṟu,* from 13 to 37 lines, these at least should be considered to have been collected by one editor, at one time, and not as they stand now distributed among different sovereigns and different scholars. Further, there are certain features in the collections themselves which may rouse reasonable suspicion in the mind of any candid scholar. Each of the 'Puram' and 'Agam' collections contains stanzas to a fixed number 400 or thereabouts. Are we to assume that the redactor for some reason or other fixed a uniform limit for these collections? This might be conveniently assumed if there had been only one redactor. But at present the collections are assigned to different scholars and the question may naturally arise why should these later authors allow

themselves to be constrained to stick to the original number 'four hundred'. Could it be the result of a mere sense of uniformity or a blind copying of an established model? It would be interesting also to inquire how these late redactors would have gone to their work if the poems they happened to handle had fallen short of or exceeded the particular number 'four hundred'. Then again, the Brahman Poet Kapilar, of whose sixty-six poems in the Agam collections, sixty pieces happen to be of the *Kuṟiñci* class,[1] seems to have been brought in to figure as the author of *Kuṟiñcipāṭṭu,* in the *Ten Idylls,* of the third hundred treating of the *Kuṟiñci* Love in *Aiṅkuṟunūṟu,* and of the Kuṟiñcikkali section in *Kalittokai.* It is very unlikely that a much-travelled poet—as Kapilar was reputed to have been—should have confined his poetical efforts to the description of only the *Kuṟiñci* Love. His poems in the *Puṟanāṉūṟu* collection are enough to establish the width of his interests, the catholicity of his views, and the comprehensiveness of his poetical talents. However, in the opinion of an admiring posterity, he was somehow made to play on only the *Kuṟiñci* key. Then again, a careful comparison of *Aiṅkuṟunūṟu,* and *Kalittokai* brings to light certain interesting bits of information about the manner in which these collections were made. *Aiṅkuṟunūṟu,* the earliest collection made probably by Perundēvanār, who sang the Mahabharata story in Tamil, stands thus, its five divisions being distributed among five different authors.

Division.		Subject-matter.		Poet.
1st Hundred	..	Marutam	..	Ōrampōkiyār.
2nd "	..	Neytal	..	Ammūvanār.
3rd "	..	Kuṟiñci	..	Kapilar.
4th "	..	Pālai	..	Ōtal Āntaiyār.
5th "	..	Mullai	..	Pēyanār.

(1) Love of the *Kuṟiñci* type is the 'love at first-sight', the love which springs naturally in the breast of lovers when they meet each other. The convention of the Tamil Poets restricts this to happen only in the hilly places. This type of love leads at once to the sexual union of the lovers and brings about their natural marriage, marriage without the preliminaries of parental consent and other shastraic rites and requirements.

It would be instructive to note whether these five poets and Perundēvanār, the redactor, appear as authors of any of the poems in the *Puram* and *Agam* collections and if they do so, what the nature of their poems is. For facility of comparison, I give the facts in a tabulated form.

Poet.	*Aganānūṟu.*	*Naṟṟiṇai.*	*Kuṟuntokai.*	Total.	*Puṟanānūṟu.*
1. Ōrampōkiyār	2 Marutam	2 Marutam	2 Marutam 1 Kuṟiñci 1 Neytal — 4	6 Marutam 1 Kuṟiñci 1 Neytal — 8	1
2. Ammūvanār	5 Neytal	8 Neytal 2 Pālai — 10	10 Neytal 1 Kuṟiñci — 11	23 Neytal 2 Pālai 1 Kuṟiñci — 26	Nil.
3. Kapilar	17 Kuṟiñci 1 Pālai — 18	15 Kuṟiñci 2 Neytal 1 Marutam 1 Mullai — 19	28 Kuṟiñci 1 Neytal — 29	60 Kuṟiñci 3 Neytal 1 Pālai 1 Marutam 1 Mullai — 66	31
4. Ōtalāntaiyār	Nil	Nil	3 Pālai	3 Pālai	Nil.
5. Pēyanār	1 Mullai	Nil	2 Mullai 1 Kuṟiñci 1 Marutam — 4	3 Mullai 1 Kuṟiñci 1 Marutam — 5	Nil.
Perundēvanār	1 Pālai	1 Kuṟiñci	Nil	1 Pālai 1 Kuṟiñci — 2	Nil.
Bhāratam Pāḍiya Perundēvanār	Nil	Nil	Nil		Nil.

First as to Perundēvanār, who affixes invocatory stanzas to the *Agam, Puram,* and *Aiṅkuṟunūṟu* collections, tradition distinguishes him from the Perundēvanār who has left us two poems in *Agaṇānūṟu* and *Naṟṟiṇai* and from a later namesake, who composed the Mahābhārata story in 'veṇbā' verse, and was a contemporary of the Pallava King 'Nandipōttarasan' of the ninth century A.D. We have absolutely nothing by way of evidence either to confirm or contradict this assertion. Still judging from literary evidence alone gathered from a comparison of the fragments of Bhāratam Pāḍiya Perundēvanār's work (composed in the Champu style of the Sanskrit authors in mixed verse and prose) with the *Bhārata Veṇbā* of the ninth century Perundēvanār, one can scarcely feel justified in identifying their authors. Nor can one dogmatically assert the authenticity of the floating stanzas preserved in the work of the commentators—the ancient Champu Tamil Bhāratam comes to us in no better garb than these. Hence one has to be very careful and cautious in using such disconnected literary chips for historical purposes. Sadly have the biographies of even many later poets been twisted into fantastic forms by certain unscrupulous writers interlarding the account with their own pieces, composed solely with a view to embellish such narratives. Even if Bhāratam Pāḍiya Perundēvanār could not be identified with his 9th century namesake, I find no reason why the Perundēvanār of the Sangam works, who seems to belong to a much later period than Paraṇar or Kapilar, could not be assumed as the author of the missing Champu treatise and the redactor of the Sangam works in question. It is bootless, however, to move in a region of pure speculation where there is not even a solitary foot-hold to support us. Though we know so little of this Perundēvanār, his handling of *Aiṅkuṟunūṟu* is suggestive of some valid reflections. Any reader of this work must be convinced that it is a much later production by its style and treatment and is the handiwork of one

author. Probably the redactor, not having before him the name of the author and thinking that the collection work he was engaged in required that the work should be considered a joint-production, carried out his idea of distributing its authorship among five poets of a past age. In this distribution, however, he appears to have been guided by a consistent and rational principle. The table appended above will show that the first three poets, who have been assigned by him to the *Marutam*, the *Neytal* and the *Kuṟiñci* hundred respectively, were exactly those who have sung the most in *Marutam, Neytal* and *Kuṟiñci,* in the *Agam* collection. The last two, Ōtalāntaiyār and Pēyanār, however, do not figure so prominently for *Pālai* and *Mullai* compositions. If Pālai Pāḍiya Peruṅkaḍuṅkō and Māmūlanār—two other poets in these collections who seem to have specialised in *Pālai* had preceded him, certainly the name of either of them would have been invoked instead of Ōtalāntai's. However, this omission appears to have been rectified by a still later redactor of *Kalittokai,* who brings in Pālai Pāḍiya Peruṅkaḍuṅkō to play the author of the *Pālaikkali* chapter in that work. Here also the whole *Kalittokai* containing 150 stanzas inclusive of the invocation seems from internal evidence to be the work of one author, belonging to Madura country, if not to Madura itself.[1] It forms an artistic whole by itself and its authorship was ascribed to Poet Nallantuvanār by the late Dāmōdaran Pillai in the first edition. But some scholars would not be satisfied with one writer claiming the authorship of the whole work which unhappily was named *Kalittokai* (literally collection of 'kali' verse) and set themselves furiously to think whether a work openly going under the name 'Collection' could in any manner be ascribed to a single author. Forthwith they produced a floating stanza[2]—such verses carry considerable weight

(1) *Vide* Appendix III: Authorship of *Kalittokai.*

(2) "பெருங்கடுங்கோன் பாலை கபிலன் குறிஞ்சி
மருதனிள நாகன் மருத—மருஞ்சோழ

with the people—and made a distribution which, for the most part, follows no principle whatever. The distribution of *Kalittokai,* effected in the later edition stands thus:

I.	*Pālaikkali*	ascribed to	Pālai Pāḍiya Peruṅkaḍuṅkō.
II.	*Kuṟiñcikkali*	„	Kapilar.
III.	*Marutakkali*	„	Marutan Iḷanāgan.
IV.	*Mullaikkali*	„	Nalluruttiran.
V.	*Neytaṟkali*	„	Nallantuvanār.

Leaving aside Pālai Pāḍiya Peruṅkaḍuṅkō and Kapilar, who have a very large number of *Pālai* and *Kuṟiñci* pieces to their credit, the other three authors require some justification. Of them, Nalluruttiran does not appear in any of the collections we just now consider; and Nallantuvan has two stanzas of the *Pālai* and the *Kuṟiñci* class in his name and has not touched *Neytal* at all. The most glaring piece of short-sightedness appears to have been as regards *Marutakkali.* This late systematiser was evidently misled by the name Marutan Iḷanāgan, Iḷanāgan, the son of Marutan, and supposed that he must have been so called by his having specialised in poems treating of the *Marutam* love. But a reference to the *Agam* or 'love collection' will demonstrate that of the five kinds of love treated of by the Tamil poets, he seems to have composed the fewest possible stanzas in *Marutam.* Of the thirty-nine poems of his appearing in *Aganānūṟu, Naṟṟiṇai* and *Kuṟuntokai,* 17 deal with *Pālai,* 9 with *Kuṟiñci,* 5 with *Mullai,* 5 with *Neytal,* and only 3 with *Marutam.* A more unhappy choice to represent a *Marutam* singer could not certainly have been made! Perhaps it might be urged that this paucity of *Marutam* stanzas was sought to be remedied by the Poet composing *Marutakkali* which contains 35 stanzas on the whole. There is however no use in exhausting possibilities by such suppositions. No doubt, the classification of the poems by *Tiṇais* and

னல்லுருத்தி ரன்முல்லை நல்லந் துவனெய்தல்
கல்விவலார் கண்ட கலி''

Turais[1] is the product of a later systematisation and need not be pressed too much for any positive conclusion. One fact, however, stands prominently out: that *Kalittokai* collection or rather distribution was made at a period much later than when *Aiṅkuṟunūṟu* was taken up by Perundēvanār. That being established, it would be pertinent to inquire why Perundēvanār, the earlier writer, should have omitted handling Kapilar's *Kuṟiñcikkali*, which he should have doubtless come across? Turning to *Patiṟṟuppattu* (The 'Ten Tens'), it is another collection of poems which comes to us in a mutilated form. The issued edition of the work contains only eight poems by eight poets (each poem comprising ten stanzas), the first and the tenth poem not appearing in any of the existing manuscripts. Unlike the other collections, this particular set of poems is confined to the glorification of one particular dynasty of the Tamil sovereigns—the Chēras. We may reasonably conclude that it should have been composed and put into the present shape under the patronage of the Chēra rulers of the West Coast. It seems to be purely a local collection and as such can scarcely take rank with the other poems in their general authority. Considering the style of some of the pieces appearing in it, I am inclined to assign some at least to a little later period than the *Agaṅānūṟu* and *Puṟanāṉūṟu* collections. Take for instance, the fourth poem by Poet Kāppiyāṟṟu Kāppiyanār and you will find it is composed on the principle of what is known as 'Anthāthi thodai', a device in versification by which a poet begins a stanza from some word or phrase which marks the close of the preceding stanza. I am sure this device of a later versifying period did not exist at the time when the poets of the *Agaṉānūṟu* age extemporised

(1) The course of love is first distributed under five major classes called *Tiṇai*, following the five classes of land, *Kuṟiñci* (hill-country), *Pālai* (desert), *Mullai* (forest), *Marutam* (agricultural country or cultivated plains), and *Neytal* (sea-coast), in which it happens to take place. *Turai* is the name of the sub-classes portraying subjective states or objective situations bearing on them, under each *Tiṇai* named above.

their poems with little or no idea of the cut-and-dried formulæ of the later prosodists. Moreover, this work, like *Aiṅkuṟunūṟu* and *Kalittokai,* seems to have been composed on a uniform plan previously agreed upon by the various authors concerned. These look like so many competition essays on a prescribed theme to comprise a definite number of stanzas, with coincidences in sentiments and phraseology in their actual make-up. If these had been written by different authors, one should assume that each one of them followed a common model and had also confined himself to one particular portion of the subject treated of. I doubt whether *Patiṟṟuppattu* or at least a good portion of it is not the work of one author, set to the work of glorifying the line of the Chēra Kings by a later sovereign of that dynasty. Even here, as in the case of *Kalittokai,* the later redactor with no clue about its authorship may have ascribed the pieces to different contemporary poets. It is also possible to conceive that the redactor had before him a bunch of poems by various authors and that by a judicious selection he picked out some and put them on a uniform plan. Speculations like these, however, will not help us to any settled conclusion until these works have been subjected to a strict critical examination conducted primarily on linguistic grounds. And this can be undertaken only after the indexing work of the Sangam poems which is now under preparation is completed and a comparative study is entered upon and carried out on scientific lines. Till then we have to suspend judgment. On one point, however, there cannot be any two opinions: that most of the poems in the four collections *Puṟanāṉūṟu, Agaṉāṉūṟu, Naṟṟiṇai* and *Kuṟuntokai* belong to a period decidedly anterior to that of *Patiṟṟuppattu, Aiṅkuṟunūṟu, Kalittokai* and *Paripāḍal.* Of the latter class, only *Patiṟṟuppattu,* the rest not treating of the dynastic annals, contains matter historically useful and it may be utilised to draw such secondary evidence from as would throw additional light on the primary evidence of the four earlier col-

lections. *Pattuppāṭṭu* (the 'Ten Idylls') also may supply us with valuable secondary evidence of a like kind.

The testimony of the four collections: Primary.

10. The four collections, *Puṟanānūṟu, Agaṉānūṟu, Naṟṟiṇai* and *Kuṟuntokai,* from the testimony of which the Synchronistic Tables are constructed, have, in spite of the later accretions to their main corpus, still a value of their own. Fortunately, the later interpolations are mostly in the *Agam* group of poems, which may safely be left out of account. They can offer us but little help in the determination and arrangement of the historical facts with which alone the Synchronistic Tables here attempted will concern themselves. As for the main historical testimony derived from these works, I have to urge that its value should in no way be discounted on the ground of the mere accident of its having been tampered with by the systematizing zeal of a late editor or the mytho-poetic elaboration of the Sangam fabulist. These later efforts were doubtless due to the idea that the Sangam poems themselves would thereby gain immensely in value. But the irony of circumstances has brought about a new critical spirit, which considers and cannot but consider these well-meant endeavours on the part of the old scholars as having only muddled the pure waters of the head stream. The modern critic has to strip away the mythic and formalistic wrappages thrown by later scholars round a body of genuine works, before arriving at the central kernel of truth. Even after piercing through such later accretions he is now and then brought face to face with certain inherent features of the works themselves which, on account of their strangeness, are apt to raise in his mind doubts about the genuineness of the writings embodying them. To mention but two of these, he comes across the names of Kings and Poets, which, to his modern ears attuned to other sounds, cannot but have a strange and even fantastic ring about them. Names such as Ūnpotipasuṅkuḍaiyār, Irumpiḍarttalaiyār,

Kalāttalaiyār, Kaḻaitinyānaiyār, Kākkaipāṭiniyār, Kuṇḍukaṉ-pāliyātan, Nariveruttalaiyār, Naḷḷi, Kiḷḷi, Pāri, Ōri, Kāri, Eḻini, Evvi, Ātan, Aḻisi, Kaṅkan, Kaṭṭi[1] must naturally sound uncouth. And the names of the early sovereigns of the three famous Tamil dynasties, the Chēra, the Chōḻa and the Pāṇdiya, have little or no connection with the more polished and sonorous Sanskrit names of their successors in the line. Add to this another peculiarity due to the limitations under which the late redactor had to carry out his self-imposed or patron-directed task. The names of many poets seem to have been lost for ever by the time the poems reached his hands. He was actually faced with the difficulty of finding out the names of the real authors of such pieces and appears to have hit upon the ingenious plan of creating descriptive designations for the innominate authors by some striking turn of expression or thought occurring in their poems. Here is, for instance, one poet in the *Kuṟuntokai* collection called Cempulappeynīrār from the phrase 'Cempulappeynīr' (water falling on red soil) of stanza 40; and in 41, the phrase 'Aṇilāḍumunṟil' (a courtyard where squirrels play) gives rise to Aṇilāḍu Munṟilār, the descriptive name for the poet whose proper appellation we have no means of tracing out at present. Very many names occur like this in the other collections also; but these singularities due to the distance of time

(1) A comparison of such personal names with the proper names of individuals of later times is instructive and interesting. At present South Indian personal names are borrowed mostly from the names of Gods and Goddesses of the Hindu Pantheon and this practice must have come into vogue with the dawn of the Religious epoch—the period of Hindu reaction against the heretical sects. In names, at least, the work of the so-called Aryanisation has been thorough. Ever since the Aryan domination came to be felt in politics and religion of the Tamil country, a process of re-naming of persons, countries, cities, rivers, mountains, and other objects was set on foot and seems to have been steadily pursued. This was the first step in the Aryanisation work. And after the new names became established in currency, all sorts of stories were later on spun round them to show how the cities and rivers came into existence after the Aryan contact with the south. A study of the ancient geography of Tamiḻagam as disclosed in the works of Pliny, Ptolemy and the *Periplus* will establish how this re-naming has rendered the task of identification extremely difficult and irksome.

which separates us from the date of their composition should not lead us to place these ancient works out of court. It will be known to our readers that Prof. Julien Vinson of Paris, a Tamil scholar of reputation in the West, could not bring himself to view such singularities with true critical insight and sympathetic imagination. From a few of these strange features catching his eye and ear, he seems to have jumped to the amazing conclusion that this vast group of early Tamil Literature is one grand pile of daring forgery and hence does not and cannot serve the historian in any manner whatsoever. I shall revert to this wholesale condemnation proceeding from the extreme sceptical school in a later part of this paper and try to present the reader not with any *a priori* counter-arguments of my own but only with facts culled from this group of works and standing inter-related with one another in a wholly consistent manner. Forgery on a large scale will hardly possess an inner coherency of its own unless the author takes very elaborate care to previously arrange the materials on a consistent plan. Indeed the charge of forgery against the whole group of the works styled the "Sangam poems" is too preposterous to be entertained as a serious hypothesis. Involving as it does a whole cycle of poems, the assumption of forgery requires not merely one or two individual authors but a large number of them of different places and times conspiring to bring into existence a factitious literature on a very extended scale. And, what, after all, could be the motive for such an elaborate system of forgery? I can well understand the inspiring motive of individual fabricators in producing isolated works and palming them off on a credulous public; but the assumption that such a motive could energise a company of writers to build up a mass of faked literature is too wild to deserve any detailed criticism.

The Result of the literary valuation.

11. Reserving however this part of the subject for later comment as occasion may arise, I shall briefly recapitulate the results

of the literary valuation to which the Naturalistic group of the Sangam Compositions has been subjected at such length and the light it throws upon the succession of such works in time. As already pointed out, the Ethical group is the latest in this cycle. The Naturalistic group, which precedes this, is composed of the *Pattuppāṭṭu* (the 'Ten Idylls'), and the *Eṭṭuttokai* (the Eight Collections). *Paripāḍal,* one of the Eight Collections, happens to be the latest among these both by its style and subject-matter. Its scarcely concealed religious motive stamps it as later than many of the Ethical treatises. This work accordingly has been left out of the purview of this paper. *Kalittokai* and *Aiṅkuṟunūṟu,* though they are earlier compositions than *Paripāḍal,* are also of later origin and further have little value for the general historian. These also I have refrained from utilising. Of the remaining, the four collections known as *Puṟanāṉūṟu, Agaṉāṉūṟu, Naṟṟiṇai* and *Kuṟuntokai* form the main basis and supply us with the primary evidence for the early history of the Tamils; the two remaining works, *Patiṟṟuppattu* and *Pattuppāṭṭu,* though decidedly later than many poems in the four collections, are by their style and subject-matter not far removed from them. I intend using them as offering valuable corroborative testimony to the facts which are disclosed by the four collections themselves. Wherever these two works, *Patiṟṟuppattu* and *Pattuppāṭṭu,* happen to conflict with the evidence of the primary group, they have to be discarded. In no way can we use these to overthrow the testimony of those early works. But in matters where their facts fit in well with those contained in the primary group, their coincidence should naturally supply us with an additional ground for confidence in the validity of the truths we arrive at. It needs scarcely pointing out that in such an endeavour as I am here engaged in, wherein a goodly portion of the legitimately styled Sangam works themselves have been excluded from utilization on the suspicion of their late origin, such works as *Cilappadi-*

kāram and *Maṇimēkalai* stand entirely ruled out. They are decidedly much later than the latest of the Naturalistic group, *Kalittokai* and *Paripāḍal;* and cannot even come very near the main work of the Ethical period, *Kuṟaḷ* for instance. They may be ascribed to the period just preceding the dawn of the Religious epoch, say the sixth century A.D., at the earliest. Herein I am guided by a sense of the literary development alone and my complaint against certain scholars who have valiantly fought for the inclusion of these two works in the Sangam collections is that they have wholly failed to apply the preliminary literary test to them before trying to quarry into the shafts of these later formations for historical materials. Their overzealous championship of these late works has only made their opponents the more determined than ever to bring down the dates of the earlier works to the level of these evidently later compositions.

Succession of the Sangam Works: Their broad arrangement in Time.

12. Whatever be the centuries to which we may ascribe these works, the scheme that is set forth in the previous section as a result of our literary valuation furnishes us with a key for reading the history of their relative development in time. Taking into consideration the predominant national characteristic of the Tamil race—its materialistic and utilitarian bent of mind—the Religious epoch could not have preceded the Ethical, nor the Ethical, the Naturalistic period of its thought and life. Confining our attention to the Naturalistic period, here too we find the longer compositions could in no way precede the shorter efforts. Trying to reverse their order of succession would be just like attempting to misread the life-history of a tree, by shifting its sapling stage to succeed its fully-developed condition. The laws of mental growth as exhibited by a nation are as invariable as the physical laws and as incapable of inversion or deviation. This scheme then gives us the initial guidance for distributing the works under certain broad periods. Within

each period the works may have to be arranged by a resort to nicer and more accurate methods. The standard furnished by a sense of the literary development, based on the growth of the national mind, necessarily proceeds on averages and is certainly not applicable to the judgment of individual minds or their works. Few will doubt the utility of large balances weighing tons of material for not coming up to the delicacy and accuracy of a chemist's balance devised to measure exceedingly small particles of matter. The former is as necessary as the latter and is equally trustworthy if some allowance be made for a narrow margin of error. Both in the shorter and longer compositions, it is necessary to make a further distinction by the application of another well-known psychological truth. These efforts of individual poets may proceed either upon a subject furnished by an external object or person; or upon a subject improvised by the poet himself for his own satisfaction. By the accepted psychological uniformity of the perceptual activity of the mind preceding the conceptual, in individuals as in nations, the compositions having an objective reference should be considered as naturally preceding those of a purely subjective kind. Human mind is thrown on its own resources only when it fails to get an object of the external world to fasten itself upon. The metaphysical view of the mind embodied in the 'Soul' theory, which invests it with certain inherent powers not derivable from its contact with Nature, does not, however, lend itself for any treatment from the standpoint of the Natural Sciences. A naturalistic view of the mind, on which alone its uniformities could be observed and enunciated, requires of us to consistently apply this principle in the valuation of a nation's literary works and seek to arrange them in the right order of sequence. Accordingly, the *Puṟanāṉūṟu* collection, which deals with the objective events and conditions, should precede the *Agam* group of poems and *Pattuppāṭṭu* and *Patiṟṟuppattu* among the longer compositions should

for a like reason stand anterior to *Aiṅkuṟunūṟu, Kalittokai* and *Paripāḍal.* A general comparison instituted between these works on various linguistic and literary grounds also goes to confirm the justice of the broad chronological arrangement herein proposed. Another consideration also adds its weight to this arrangement. Later interpolations have crept in more into what I may call the 'subjective' group than in the 'objective'. From the very nature of the 'subjective' poems themselves, it is much easier to tamper with pure mental constructions than with the compositions which have an immediate and even organic relationship with external facts, persons or events. In the latter case, apart from other grounds, distance in time alone should place the fabricator under the most serious difficulty to execute his interpolation with success. As an instance, I may point out that in the *Puṟanāṉūṟu* collection of poems I have not the least doubt that pieces of late authors have found their way; but, these later pieces not having any intimate relationship with the persons and events therein celebrated, by far the greater number of the poems of that collection stand apart and could be spotted out with a little careful discrimination. This circumstance, then, is an additional ground why the compositions having an objective reference should be considered as forming most of the earliest efforts of the Tamil Muse.

The basic works for the Synchronistic Tables.

13. The somewhat detailed inquiry we have thus far pursued and the literary valuation thereby effected enable us to accept for the construction of the Synchronistic Tables only six works as valuable and authoritative for the earliest period of Tamil History. Of the nine works forming the Naturalistic group, *Aiṅkuṟunūṟu, Kalittokai,* and *Paripāḍal* are left out of account. And even among the remaining six works, *Pattuppāṭṭu* and *Patiṟṟuppattu* are taken in as affording only secondary evidence for purposes of confirmation. Their facts are not allowed to take the lead in the con-

struction of the Tables. The Tables, I am here presenting, thus rest solely on the statement of the facts contained in the four *Puram* and *Agam* collections. Their validity is neither more nor less than the validity of the testimony of these works. And what value should one attach to this earliest stratum of Tamil Literature? I have elsewhere[1] discussed certain linguistic peculiarities of *Puṟanāṉūṟu* which have not come within the ambit of the Tolkāppiya Sutras and drawn a reason therefrom to establish the anteriority of *Puṟanāṉūṟu* to *Tolkāppiyam,* the so-called Grammatical authority for the second Sangam Literature. Hence it is that I make bold to characterize these four collections as embodying some of the earliest compositions of Tamil genius. Attempts to put them on a par with *Cilappadikāram* and *Maṇimēkalai,* or even with the still earlier works *Tolkāppiyam* and *Kuṟaḷ,* and consider them as contemporaneous in the lump are hopelessly misdirected and will lead only to a piteous distortion of ancient Tamil chronology. Looking at these poems as a whole, they strike us as a strange body of literature belonging to a different world, with apparently little or no connection with even the mediæval literature dating from the Religious epoch of the seventh century A.D. The Dēvāra hymns of Tiruñānasambandha and these early poems are separated by a gap appreciably wide enough as that which divides the classical Sanskrit from the Rig Vedic dialect in the North. Their purity of language, their simplicity of thought, their freedom from the conceits, conventions and mythologic paraphernalia of a later age, their unstudied directness and even *naieté* in the portrayal of the life and manners of an early age, and their many verbal and grammatical enigmas which have been most faithfully preserved and handed down by successive generations of scholars with little or no attempt at their elucidation, all these attest as much to their ancientness as to their genuineness. Setting aside the question of their age

(1) *Vide* Author's *"Relative Ages of Puṟanāṉūṟu and Tolkāppiyam'*

for the time being, all that is necessary to establish here is that we are dealing with a genuine body of a nation's literature and not with an artificial literary concoction. Taking the one outstanding fact that this early literature contains numerous accounts of the habits, manners, customs and observances of the early Tamils which are anything but edifying to the *amor propre* of their present-day descendants, this also must render the hypothesis of forgery untenable. If a nation had unduly exalted itself by a series of works, one could at least catch hold of *that* as a motive for fabrication. But here the picture presented by these works about the life and thought of ancient Tamiḻagam is certainly not all rosy. No fabricator would have left[*] behind him works such as these, works which neither himself nor any one of his nation could view—at least in some portions—with any feeling of complacency. Hence the idea of a forgery is unthinkable. The most crushing reply to this gratuitous assumption however is given by the remarkable consistency which runs through the Synchronistic Tables themselves, and to these I shall now pass on.

PART II.

THE SYNCHRONISTIC TABLES AND THEIR TEN GENERATIONS.

Difficulties in our way.

14. As stated already, these poems come to us in an artificial grouping introduced by the redactor consisting of *Tiṇais* and *Tuṟais*, with introductory notes from his pen added to many of them. In the absence of any other contemporary writing by which we can check the references in these poems, these notes must remain the only source of information about the persons and events alluded to in the pieces. Still in utilizing such information, I have taken care not to allow them to overweigh the primary testimony of the poems themselves. In cases where the latter come into clear conflict with the former, the former have been made to give way. But in all other matters some weight was allowed to the evidence of these editorial notes, especially because the redactor, however, removed from the times of the Sangam works in question, was still nearer them than we are and may be presumed to have been conversant with the testimony of some living tradition or of some authoritative works to which he had access and which have since then disappeared. I have been all the more inclined to ascribe some value to these explanatory notes of the first Editor, because of their matter-of-fact character and freedom from any mythologic embellishments.

Turning to the poems themselves, a goodly number contain no reference whatever to any king or chieftain. These may be dismissed from notice for the time being. Nor can all the poems which have such reference be useful for the Tables. Most of them refer to a past event or a person who lived long before the poet himself. Except

for the information that the person referred to by the poet must have lived before the poet himself, these pieces offer but little help. Many of the stanzas of Nakkīrar and Māmūlanār fall under this class. These poets display more than ordinary proneness to recount past occurrences with many details concerning the rulers and chiefs of an earlier time. But unless we can confidently fix the time of any of such poets themselves, their narratives, however rich in personal allusions, and however elaborate in details, will not have any chronological value. I have found Māmūlanār, the most allusively inclined of the poets, except perhaps Paraṇar, also the most elusive of them. With all my efforts, I have to confess that I have not yet succeeded in locating him in a particular generation. Nakkīrar, however, stands on a different footing. He happens to sing of a contemporary King and his time is thereby determined beyond reasonable doubt. This leads me to a discussion of the value of the poems of contemporary singers. As a Table of Synchronism should be raised mostly, if not solely, on contemporaneous references, I have had to scrutinize with great care the nature and drift of the poems purporting to contain only such references. Among these, some contain unmistakable evidence of contemporaneity; while others are simply reported to be such by the attached editorial note and do not directly signify contemporaneity by their language. To keep the Tables free from doubtful matter, I have uniformly rejected these dubious stanzas for their lack of any direct evidence of time. In fact, the greatest caution had had to be exercised in the selection of the poems which would be considered as possessing evidentiary value for chronological purposes. In the practical carrying out of this part of the work, the difficulty of distinguishing between contemporaneous references and those concerning the past times was indeed a formidable one. It would be admitted on all hands that in early Tamil the verb of predication signified time only in a very limited, indefinite and hazy manner.

The sense of time seems to have been and is so weak that even modern Tamil can scarcely be held to make the faintest approach to the many grades of tenses and moods that we find for instance in English. Hence the determination of the time of an event the poet sings about was in many instances attended with great difficulty. Still, by a detailed and careful comparison of the various attendant circumstances such difficulties were overcome and a tolerably correct conclusion arrived at.

Another difficulty arose from the confusion of the personal names. The application of one and the same name or descriptive appellation to different persons, with distinct historical achievements of their own, has been the source of serious misapprehension and misreading of ancient Tamil History. For instance, each of the names, *Karikālan* and *Pasumpūṇ Pāṇḍiyan,* will be found to refer to two distinct personages with a separate historical setting for each. For purposes of correct chronology and history they should be differentiated and kept apart. Herein, the mistaken identification by later commentators has misled not a few into false paths and until the whole of this imposing structure of error is swept away we shall not be able to get at the correct point of view of the past events or their connections. As I shall deal with this part of the problem in its proper place, it need not be dilated upon here.

The difficulties in respect of the peculiar names of the Poets, Kings and others to which I have already alluded are however more seeming than real. It is true that such names, as Palsālai Mudukuḍumi Peruvaḻudi (பல்சாலை முதுகுடுமிப்பெருவழுதி) and Talaiyālaṅkānattu-Cheru-Venṟa Pāṇḍiyan (தலையாலங்கானத்துச் செருவென்ற பாண்டியன்), are descriptive names and not proper. If we can realise the position of dependence of the early Poets on the goodwill and munificence of the kings of that time and the unbounded power for good or evil that came to be wielded by the latter, we

may well understand why their subjects, the poets not excepted, considered it a sacrilege to mention the proper names of their rulers. They had to resort to other devious expedients for naming them; and this they seem to have done invariably by connecting the kings with some of their achievements or other incidents in their lives and coining therefrom descriptive appellations by which they could be known to their contemporaries. The phrase Cerup-pāḻi-Eṟinda-Iḷañcēṭcenni (செருப்பாழி எறிந்த இளஞ்சேட் சென்னி), for instance, thus refers to the young Cenni or Chōḷa Prince who overthrew the Pāḻi fortress; Rājasūyam-Vēṭṭa-Perunaṟkiḷḷi (இராசசூயம்வேட்ட பெருநற்கிள்ளி), to the great Narkiḷḷi or Chōḷa King who performed the Rājasūyam sacrifice. The words, Cenni (சென்னி) and Kiḷḷi[1] (கிள்ளி), occurring in these descriptive phrases, whatever be their origin, have come to signify, in the post-Karikāl usage, the Chōḷa rulers as generic names. This peculiar usage notwithstanding, the individual sovereigns have been accurately identified. The very uniformity of practice pursued by the ancient poets in the use of such descriptive cognomens renders the identification for all intents and purposes satisfactory. So, we shall be well justified in treating these descriptive appellations as if they were

(1) Some writers are fond of deriving the proper names of this ancient period from some significant root or other. Though their attempts may not add visibly to the riches of Tamil philology, they are worth noticing. As an instance, I shall give here Dr. Pope's derivation of the name Kiḷḷi, as signifying the Chōḷa sovereign. He writes in his translation of the 400 Lyrics: *Puṟanānūṟu* as follows:—"*Kiḷḷi* was the family name of a renowned dynasty of Chōḷa Kings, eight of whom are mentioned in this connection. Its derivation is doubtful, but it may mean a digger and is in fact a synonym of Pallava". He adds in a footnote the equation Paḷ=Kiḷ. Now Kiḷ as in Kiḷai, Kiḷir, Kiḷḷākku also means a sprout, tender shoot or leaf. The name could equally be derived from that root. In fact, without more authentic details of the origin of the Chōḷa line of kings or of their tribe, the derivation of their names cannot be anything else than highly conjectural. Ancient history should come to re-inforce the conclusions of Philology and where the latter seeks to reach a period far transcending that of the former, its conclusions can at best be only hypothetical. I consider 'Cenni' and 'Kiḷḷi' in pre-Karikāl usage as denoting two different branches of the Chōḷa family of kings as may be inferred from the facts brought out in the Tables.

proper names attached to particular individuals concerned and also in using them for the compilation of the Tables.

The Personages in the Tables.

15. Most of the persons who appear in the Tables come under one or other of the three classes, *viz.*, Poets, Kings and Chiefs. A few public functionaries or private citizens are also occasionally mentioned in the poems; but these will hardly be of any use for our purpose. Among the three classes specified, the kings alone are expected to show a line of continuous succession and hence must form the very back-bone of the chronological system herein sought to be formed. The poets, both great and less, have to be referred to the kings about whom they have sung as contemporaries and thus assigned to a definite period in the Tables. And of the three lines of the Tamil sovereigns, the Chōḻa dynasty alone shows a succession for ten generations without a breach. The Chēra and the Pāṇḍiya houses, on the other hand, lack this continuity. Hence the Chōḻa line had perforce to be adopted as the standard for reference and comparison. As to the chieftains too, who play a large part in the transactions of this early period, the reader will find that as he moves down the times their numbers get thinner and thinner, until at last most of their lines vanish from view altogether. This was due entirely to the Tamil triumvirs, in spite of their internecine rivalry and warfare, entering into an overt or covert league for the extermination of those old-time kingships. In fact, one will be led to conclude from the early accounts that the so-called Tamil chieftains were really tribal sovereigns who were either annihilated or brought under subjection for the consolidation of the Tamil Monarchies which may truly be said to have arisen from their ashes. The Rise and Expansion of the Tamil Monarchies must always remain an interesting chapter in the ancient History of the Tamils and deserves therefore a separate study and treatment.

16. The Tables consist of four horizontal columns, the first column being reserved for the Pāṇḍiya line of sovereigns, the second for the Chōḻa, the third for the Chēra and the fourth for the various chieftains who turn up in this literature. These four horizontal columns are divided into ten vertical sections, each representing the period of a generation. By reading down a vertical column you get the names of the various contemporaries of a particular generation. By following the horizontal column from left to right you get the names of the successors in subsequent generations. In both the vertical and horizontal columns some names appear more than once and serve as links to hold the generations together. If a poet sings as a contemporary of a particular Pāṇḍiya sovereign and also of a particular Chōḻa king, the two rulers may naturally be considered as having lived at one and the same time, though it is quite likely that they may have lived in times slightly different but adjacent. Here the poet's name serves the purpose of a link-name and helps us to fix the representatives of different dynasties considered as belonging to one identical generation. Or it may be that while the poet sings of a particular sovereign of a particular dynasty, his son, another poet, may sing as a contemporary of another sovereign of the same dynasty. Here also the known relationship between the poet who was a father and the poet, who was a son, supplies us with a link for placing the two sovereigns in two contiguous generations, although we are left in the dark as to the exact relationship which subsisted between them. Here the link-names of the father-poet and the son-poet come under the class of what may be called horizontal or linear-link names connecting two successive generations; whereas, in the first case mentioned, the name of one and the same poet which serves to establish contemporaneity among different individuals may be styled a lateral link-name.

Description of the Tables.

In these Tables, excepting the few cases where the exact relationship between the sovereigns is known either by direct reference in literature or by tradition, all the other sovereigns have been assigned their respective places by the help of these lateral and linear link-names. The existence of these link-names alone has made the construction of the Synchronistic Tables possible; their absence, on the other hand, would certainly have rendered the present attempt abortive. As an instance of this, I may point out my inability to bring that fine synchronism of Kō-Peruñchōḻan and the Pāṇḍiya King Aṟivuḍai Nambi into relationship with these Tables for want of a link-name. Although so many as five poets, *viz.*, Pisir-Āntaiyār, Pottiyār, Pullāṟṟūr Eyiṟṟiyanār, Kaṇṇakanār, and Karuvūr Peruñcatukkattuppūdanār, have sung about one or the other of the two afore-mentioned sovereigns, they have not sung about any others in the Tables or stand related to any event in them. I am sure their patrons were later rulers, though their time would not be far removed from that of the Tables. I had therefore to leave the Kō-Peruñchōḻan Aṟivuḍai Nambi synchronism alone for the present. Possibly future research may open up a way for effecting a junction with this synchronism. The ten consecutive generations that have been brought into the Tables, prepared as these are by the help of the link-names, lateral and linear, are held together by an inseverable bond and so do not admit of any shifting of their assigned places. In order to make these Tables as accurate and reliable as possible, no pain was spared to ascertain only strictly contemporary poets, chieftains and kings for their inclusion therein. If the stanzas of a poet did not establish beyond doubt his contemporaneity with a particular king or event, he was strictly excluded. By the great care thus exercised both in the inclusion and exclusion of the names of persons, on the ground of contemporaneity or its absence, these Tables have gained in value and certitude.

As this happens to be the first serious attempt in distributing the personages of ancient Tamil Literature under a chronological scheme, I had to content myself with not attempting too much by seeking to swell the Tables by a multiplicity of names. My idea was more to secure a reliable frame-work of chronology than to include all the personages appearing in these works in a comprehensive and exhaustive enumeration. By this restriction of the scope also, the Tables, I hope, have gained a certain degree of scientific accuracy, as far as the inherent difficulties of literary materials would permit. While they allow future amplification in details, the ground-plan, I may be permitted to add, has herein been laid with due regard for the facts of Literature and their inter-relation and hence may not admit of any material alteration. Every entry in the Tables is vouched for by reference drawn from the statements of the poets and that also of only such as have direct evidentiary value. With a view to keep the Tables clear of any hypothetical matter, I have carefully avoided as far as possible interposing inferences and constructions of my own in them. However, in the solitary case of the first Chēra sovereign, I have deviated from following this general rule and have inserted in the Tables the name of a king, whose inclusion has been found necessary on grounds other than the existence of a link-name, which will be detailed later on. This solitary hypothetical insertion is marked by putting the name within square brackets, to distinguish it from the other entries which stand on a more secure basis.

As these Tables have been compiled by the help of such link-names, I think it necessary to discuss briefly the significance and use of the latter. Let us imagine a world in which all the individuals of a particular generation start and end their lives at about the same time. Here each generation would stand by itself completely severed from the one preceding or succeeding it in a sort of self-contained isolation. Whatever be the number of the

generations succeeding one another in time, we could not, in the absence of the connecting names, tell anything about their relative places in the scale of time. But the world in which we live is happily not of the imaginary type referred to above where the lives of the individuals of a particular generation are not only of equal duration but coincide with one another, in their beginning as well as their end, with absolute mathematical precision. Individuals are born and die at all times of the year and consequently overlapping of the generations is the rule rather than the exception. Thus the most natural thing for us to expect is that an individual's name will appear in two consecutive generations. It is also very likely that if an individual was blessed with an exceptional longevity, covering more than the average span of life vouchsafed to his contemporaries, his name might appear in three consecutive generations. But such instances must be considered very rare and hence should demand our most careful scrutiny. This critical sifting is all the more necessary in the ancient history of the Tamils among whom the grandson bears the identical name of his grandfather to this day. By reason of the antiquity of this practice in personal nomenclature one has to see whether the name appearing in the third generation goes to denote a different individual of the same family or the original owner of the first and the second generation. These considerations would demonstrate, at all events, that an individual could not be expected to cover four generations. It would be against the course of natural events. Possibly some may urge that, if the average duration of a generation is only 25 years, there is hardly any intrinsic impossibility, much less improbability, in imagining a centenarian to pass his life through four consecutive generations. Although one could admit the theoretic possibility of such a supposition, it should be noted that that ideal centenarian could not have any chance of leaving his mark by his activity in the domain of thought or life

in all the four generations in question. A generation, at either end, must be sliced away as not allowing him by non-age and over-age to take any active part in the affairs of the world and thus leave an impress of his personality on contemporary life or events. This, then, leaves for our consideration only the two central generations as the natural period of his activity and thought. Any attempt to stretch it beyond those natural limits must inevitably tell upon the scientific value of the work we are now engaged in. Three generations is the utmost limit to which a person could be assigned and that too in very exceptional circumstances only. But beyond it neither facts of human history nor demands of logic would permit us to go. Where such instances turn up, we have to infer the existence of two separate individuals, who have been indiscriminately mixed up by posterity for want of a scientific attitude of mind and the necessary critical insight.

To enable readers to alight at a glance on the link-names, I have underlined the lateral link-names with thick and the linear, with dotted lines. In the matter of the linear-links, the dotted lines have been further tipped with arrow-heads showing the direction in which the linking should be effected. If the name happens to connect its generation both with the preceding and succeeding ones, the underline is furnished at both ends with arrow-heads for pointing the direction of linking. If a lateral link-name serves also as a linear-link, the thick line too is provided with arrow marks. These mechanical devices, I hope, will enable the reader to get at once at the connections among the various facts of the Tables in their natural order of co-existence and succession.

The Tables and the Chola line of kings.

17. We have seen that by the systematising zeal of the earliest redactor of the Sangam works, chronology has been wrenched out of its natural joints and thrown

into great confusion, for the mere whim of an ideal rhetorical arrangement of the poems. All that we are presented with is a tangle of names of sovereigns, chieftains and poets mixed up pell-mell. The first problem was to see where to begin in this uncharted wilderness. With absolutely no guidance from literary traditions, I could know neither the beginning nor the end of any line of sovereigns just to make a start in the construction of the Tables. Even supposing that any name would be as good as any other for the end in view, still the idea could not be overcome that success or failure of the undertaking depended largely on the particular line of sovereigns chosen as the base-line of the survey. In any event, the dynasty chosen as the standard should satisfy two indispensable conditions: first, that it should present a continuous succession of rulers and secondly, that it should show a longer pedigree, on the whole, and remain in our hands an effective standard of comparison with which the other lines of kings could be correlated. If the dynasty selected as the standard should snap anywhere, the attempt at synchronisation of the other lines would be brought to a stand-still or could be carried out only in a very imperfect manner. Such contingencies of the problem weighed with me at first and led me to prospect for the choice of a secure base-line. Of nearly forty sovereigns who appear in this literature, more than twenty belong to the Chēra line. For this reason at least, this dynasty should naturally take precedence of the others and serve as the requisite norm. But in view of most, if not the whole, of the Chēra genealogy depending for its authenticity on *Patiṟṟuppattu,* a work not of impeccable authority in itself on account of its containing patent interpolations and which moreover has already been consigned to the humble rôle of mere secondary evidence, I could not bring myself to make that dynasty the standard for the construction of the Tables. Of the remaining two dynasties, the

Pāṇḍiya, though unmistakably the earliest, not possessing evident marks of a continuous succession could not be taken up. Naturally, by this process of elimination, I had to fall back on the Chōḻa line as the most satisfactory standard in the circumstances indicated. Two other reasons also lent their support for this choice. The name of Karikālan, the great Chōḻa sovereign, has pierced through the mist of ages and reached us with a halo of glory of its own. Far and away he happens to be the most conspicuous figure of that illustrious line of kings, whose military skill and humane administration laid the first foundation of a Chōḻa Empire. He was, moreover, the first and foremost patron of Tamil learning, in whose court flourished a galaxy of poets, who drew their inspiration from the vast exploits of their patron for leaving behind them literary memorials composed, for the first time, on a set plan and on a considerable scale. Karikālan's towering personality thus was one of the material factors which confirmed me in the selection of his line as the standard. The second reason which was equally decisive was the commanding position of the great poet, Paraṇar, who, seems to have attached himself to the Chōḻa line of sovereigns and sung about their remotest pedigree and their individual achievements in a manner in which no other poet has done. Like Karikālan the Great, among the rulers of that age, Paraṇar stands head and shoulders above the poets of the classic period. It would be no exaggeration to say that alike in the quality of his poetry and in the command over language, in the amplitude of his imagination and in the width of his sympathies, in the grip of contemporary life and, above all, in the delicacy of his touch, he surpasses all the classic singers, though many of these latter poets themselves, be it observed, were artists of no mean order. True, in the false estimation of a particular school of latter-day scholarship, his name was permitted to be overshadowed by that of a rival, Kapilar, who seems to have produced mass for mass

a larger bulk of poetry. But is bulk of production the measure whereby poetical merit should be judged? Probably only a quantitative judgment of poetical merit has allowed Kapilar to successfully contest with Paraṇar for the premier place amongst the company of the Sangam poets. If precedence goes by the priority of mention, the current phrase 'Kapila-Paranar' should certainly be reversed. Though Kapilar himself was a poet of high gifts, the conviction cannot be resisted that Paraṇar out-distances him in the supreme quality of poetic inspiration and many-sided grasp of life. This digression apart, Paraṇar happens to sing of a number of Chēra sovereigns also and serves as an important link of synchronism between these two famous lines of kings. Apart moreover from the many allusions to previous sovereigns strewn thick in his stanzas, he brings the Pāṇḍiya family too within the scope of his poetic survey. Utilizing to the full the advantages he appears to have enjoyed as the premier court-poet of his age, he has recorded pen-pictures of the royalty not only of his own time but of the preceding generations with a minuteness and faithfulness, all his own. This was the additional ground which fixed me in my resolve to keep the Chōḻa line as the central stem of the Tables, with which the other branches should be brought into relation.

Starting then with Karikāla Chōḻa the Great, I began jotting down the names of the contemporary poets of his period. Paraṇar, who happened to sing of Karikālan's father Uruvapahtēr Iḷañcēṭcenni and his predecessor Vēṟpahtaḍakkai Perunaṟkiḷḷi, could not reasonably be brought to Karikālan's time. And yet one cannot but note that some of his poems contain allusions to a Karikālan of old. This led me to scrutinize with care the references in all his stanzas bearing upon Karikālan; and the result of my investigation is the emergence of two distinct Karikālans with separate historic achievements standing to their credit. Till now the false lead of mediæval commentators has been followed with docile meekness by later scholars and two

distinct personalities have been jumbled up and their deeds thrown together and ascribed to one ruler. This confusion further opened the way for fanciful myths being created to explain the significance of the name Karikālan, as the 'Sovereign of the burnt-foot' and other equally amusing fabrications. Setting aside that aspect of the matter for the present, the actual construction of the Tables went to show that Karikālan's generation was preceded by five consecutive generations and succeeded by four. Thus, on the whole, we get ten generations of Chōḻa sovereigns and on the accepted scale of 25 years for a generation they cover in all 250 years. With the works at our disposal no successful attempt seems possible to extend the continuation of these generations on either end. Blocked as our way is, in both directions, the ten generations, as far as they stand inter-linked, give us a glimpse into the Chōḻa history for two centuries and a half and that in itself is no small matter. Furthermore, neither the Pāṇḍiya line nor the Chēra is found to go higher up or lower down the scale the Chōḻa dynasty furnishes us with. Accordingly, I came to the conclusion that the designation of the different periods should be done in the name of the respective Chōḻa sovereigns appearing in each. This will facilitate reference to the base-line for any future comparison and checking.

I shall now go on to consider the Synchronistic Tables in detail. The best course, I think, would be to begin with the earliest generation and then deal with each of the succeeding ones in order of time.

A New View-point.

18. Before we enter on a study of these Tables, we have to disabuse our minds of certain prepossessions and even prejudices sedulously fostered by the works of an uncritical school of writers on the question of the origin of the three Tamil monarchies. The prevailing opinion of the orthodox Pandits is to represent these three kingships as having, like Minerva from Jove's

head, sprung into existence in full panoply of power from either of the divine luminaries, the Sun and the Moon. Political thought, much less political science, could hardly have existed then and so the earliest Tamil commentators and others believed as a matter of course that the great kingdoms, whose glories have been celebrated by many a bard, should have been from the very beginning of time as extensive and powerful as they came to be in later days.[1] The promulgators of the doctrine of the divine origin and divine right of kings, a doctrine mooted and elaborated later on under religious auspices, could not brook even in idea the rise of those old-time kingships from humble beginnings.[2] The latter-day glories of the Tamil sovereigns were transferred undimmed to the hoary past and those early rulers too came somehow to be invested with the accoutrements of full-blown royalty from a time beyond the reach of history and even tradition. The tribal or communal kings consequently had to sink to the level of petty miserable chieftains by the side of the three grand Tamil colossi, chieftains whose very existence is said to have depended largely on the goodwill and grace of those autocrats who had to bestow on them their own territories for some service or other. Instead of dating the origin of the Tamil kingships from the effacement of the antecedent tribal rule as a patent fact of ancient Tamil history, later writers with a strange want of historical insight and possibly also by the inducement and active connivance of the later descendants of the Tamil triumvirs themselves, began to relate for the edification of posterity that the

(1) *Vide* Pandit R. Raghava Ayyangar's '*Vanjimānagar*', p. 11.

(2) For instance compare the spirit of the following very late panegyric composed in honour of Karikālan the Great

"அரிமா சுமந்த வமளிமே லானைத்
திருமா வளவனெனத் தேறேன்- திருமாற்பின்
மானமா லென்றே தொழுதேன்"

It means: 'I will not estimate him who occupies the lion-supported throne as simply Tirumāvaḷavan but shall consider and worship him as the great god Tirumāl himself'. Could blind adulation go further?

chieftains occupied from the very start a position of dependence on the three great sovereigns owing fealty and allegiance to them. By this view the sequence of historical events actually came to be entirely reversed and a false picture of the past created. I need hardly say that the current speculation of many in the field regarding the origin and nature of the Tamil monarchies is quite erroneous and will hardly brook a critical examination.

Whatever may be the origin of the Chēras and the Pāṇḍiyas, the testimony of these Tables is positive as regards the birth of the Chōḻa power. They take us to the very beginning and place in our hands much interesting information about the establishment at Uṟaiyūr[1] of the Chōḻa power, which in subsequent times was destined to grow to imperial dimensions little inferior to those of the Empire of Asoka, of Sāmudragupta or of Sri Harsha of North India. Tamiḻagam at the period here disclosed did not extend even to Vēṅkaḍam or the Tirupati Hill, its traditional northern boundary as laid down in the prefatory stanza attached to *Tolkāppiyam*. No doubt, it is casually mentioned by a few poets, all later singers in the group of poets we have taken up for consideration. Even they refer to it as 'Pullikāḍu' (the forest region of Pulli, the chieftain of the Kaḷva tribe). To the south of this lay another forest region Ārkkāḍu[2] (the modern Arcot districts, North and South, and Chingleput) which in subsequent

(1) Dr. Caldwell in deriving this word considers it as signifying the 'city of habitation' as if other cities and villages were not. The form '*Uṟaiyūr*' came into use at a later time, its earliest form being 'Uṟattūr', as is well evidenced by Ptolemy's 'Orthoura'. 'Uṟattūr' appears in the poems of the earliest poets in the abbreviated and softened form 'Uṟantai', just as Kaḷattūr becoming Kaḷantai, and Kuḷattūr, Kuḷantai. There was also another Uṟattūr in the Pāṇḍiya kingdom at that time, but the poet carefully distinguishes it from Chōḻa's Uṟattūr as Uṟattūr in the Arimaṇavāyilnāḍu or district (Agam 266). Restoring the name thus to its original form one would find it difficult to indulge in any etymological speculation! In an agglutinative language like Tamil, wherein attrition of words due to economy of effort is constant and is carried to the highest and even sometimes to a whimsical degree, philology is beset with peculiar difficulties.

(2) *Vide* Appendix IV. Note on Ārkkāḍu and Aruvāḷar.

times became the seat of power of the Toṇḍaiyars or Tiraiyars, another forest tribe who were replaced by the still later Pallavas. General Cunningham's opinion that Arcot is a later town and Dr. Caldwell's reference to the myth of six Rishis performing *tapas* there once upon a time are belied by the account contained in the early Tamil classical literature. This Arcot was then ruled over by one Aḻisi, presumably a chief of the Aruvāḷar or Nāga tribe. The fact that the Chōḻa kings assumed the *ār* or *ātti* flower as their royal emblem later on would show that they were connected in some way with Aḻisi or it might be that they assumed it as an emblem of their victory over Aḻisi's descendants. In any view, we have to conclude that the Chōḻa power did not extend to Ārkkāḍu at the beginning. The following lines of stanza 100 of *Naṟṟiṇai* by one unknown author, who must be evidently one of the earliest poets, speaks of Aḻisi and his forest kingdom.

"நோகினி வாழிய நெஞ்சே மேவா
ராரரண் கடந்த மாரிவண் மகிழ்த்
திதலை யெஃகிற் சேந்தன் றந்தை
தேங்கமழ் விரிதா ரியறே ரழிசி
வண்டுமூச நெய்த னெல்லிடை மலரு
மரியலங் கழனி யார்க்கா டன்ன"

That Aḻisi must have been a ruler of some note may be inferred from his country Ārkkāḍu taking another name too as Aḻisikāḍu.[1] That he was an independent ruler is clear also from Paraṇar's lines:

'நிரைய வொள்வா ளிளையர் பெருமக
னழிசி' (*Kuṟuntokai, Stanza 258*)

(1) Nakkaṇṇai, a poetess appearing in the second generation says in stanza 87 of *Naṟṟiṇai*.

"வெல்போர்ச் சோழ ரழிசியம் பெருங்காட்டு"

i.e., the Aḻisikāḍu or forest of Aḻisi, which is in the possession of the victorious Chōḻas. Whether this conquest of Arcot was made in Tittan's period or in that of his son, we have hardly any means of judging from these poems.

Here Aḻisi is definitely described as the king or chief of the Iḷaiyar[1] tribe. That he or his descendant had to lose this independence is clear from Nakkaṇṇai's verse quoted in foot-note (1) of the preceding page.

At the early time we are now discussing, the Tamil country was literally studded with numerous chieftaincies or rather kingdoms, each in independent charge of its separate clan-chief or communal ruler. According to the *Tiṇai* classification of later Tamil Grammar, which was based on facts of natural observation of the early society recorded in Tamil Literature, the country was occupied by five tribes confined to five different zones according to their pursuit or occupation. The fishing tribes, the Paratavars, were confined to the coast and the hill tribes, the Kuṟavars, found refuge in the fastnesses of the interior hills. Between the hill region and the littoral were hemmed in three other tribes, the Āyar or the shepherd or cowherd tribes of the forest area, the agricultural tribes or Uḻavars in the plains adjoining the numerous river basins, and the nomads or Eyinars (Vēḍars) plying their natural vocation of hunting and also the disreputable pursuit of plunder and pillage. These nomads could not from their natural disabilities and the peculiarity of their occupation develop even the rudiments of a tribal sovereignty. Leaving this particular tribe out of account, the remaining four tribes seem to have advanced, in varying degrees, towards a settled form of rule. The Paratavars and Kuṟavars, *i.e.*, the littoral and the hill-tribes, in their progress towards political institutions, could not advance beyond the tribal chieftaincies. Their geographical position and their fluctuating economic condition due to limited and even uncertain sources of income

(1) The name Iḷaiyar refers to a forest tribe known also as the Maḻavar. It was from this tribe that Karikālan the Great after his conquest of their forest kingdom seems to have recruited most of his army. Hence the term Maḻavar or Maḷḷar came to signify a soldier also in subsequent times. Toṇḍaiyar, Tiraiyar, Pallavar are other names under which this tribe or its mixture is known in later literature.

were alike unfavourable to any advance in political constitution. They had to stop short after reaching the tribal rulership. The remaining two tribes, the pastoral and the agricultural, appear to have advanced a stage farther and succeeded in establishing communal and even territorial kingships under the names, Kō or Vēḷ. The first idea of kingship in this part of the world arose amongst them and in the struggle for existence which ensued the agricultural kings or Vēḷs, aided by their more flourishing economic condition, their larger numbers, and greater organisation, came out eventually as the masters of the field. The whole political history of ancient Tamiḻagam was the history of the conquest in the end of all the other tribes[1]

(1) The following excerpts from Semple's classic work, ***Influences of Geographic Environment***, will add their force to the views set forth above.

Hunter Tribes: "Relying mainly on the chase and fishing, little on agriculture, for their subsistence, their relations to their soil were superficial and transitory, their tribal organisation in a high degree unstable." (p. 55.)

Fisher Tribes: "Fisher tribes, therefore, get an early impulse forward in civilization and even where conditions do not permit the upward step to agriculture, these tribes have permanent relations with their land, form stable social groups and often utilize their location as a natural highway to develop systematic trade." (pp. 56-57.)

Pastoral Tribes: "Among Pastoral nomads, among whom a systematic use of their territory begins to appear, and therefore a more definite relation between land and people, we find a more distinct notion than among wandering hunters of territorial ownership, the right of communal use, and the distinct obligation of common defence. Hence the social bond is drawn closer." (p. 57.)

"Hunter and Fisher Folk relying almost exclusively upon what their land produces of itself, need a large area and derive from it only an irregular food supply, which in winter diminishes to the verge of famine. The transition to the pastoral stage has meant the substitution of an artificial for a natural basis of subsistence, and therewith a change which more than any other one thing has inaugurated the advance from savagery to civilization. From the standpoint of Economics, the forward stride has consisted in the application of capital in the form of flocks and herds to the task of feeding the wandering horde; from the standpoint of alimentation, in the guarantee of a more reliable and generally more nutritious food-supply, which enables population to grow more steadily and rapidly; from the standpoint of geography, in the marked reduction *per capita* amount of land to yield an adequate and stable food supply. Pastoral nomadism can support in a given district of average quality from ten to twenty times as many souls as can the chase; but in this respect is surpassed from twenty to thirty-fold

by the agricultural and the establishment of the Tamil sovereignties in the valley-regions adjoining the Periyār, the Tāmraparṇi,[1] then known as Porunai, the Vaigai and the Kāviri. It would be a positive perversion of history to describe these tribal rulers as subordinate to one or other of the three Tamil sovereigns of that time. Allusions to nine kings and eleven kings and *Eḻumuḍi* (Seven Crowns) occur in some poems and these point directly to one conclusion that, before the Tamil triumvirate came into their own, they had to contest for power with a large number of tribal kings and had to wipe them out of existence or make them their feudatories in a sort of easy political alliance. The references to such a state in early literature are so abundant that I think it unnecessary to load this paper with specific quotations. The glimpse into the earliest political condition of Tamiḻagam, afforded by Tamil Literature, gives us a picture of the existence of many independent rulers and that the picture is substantially a correct one is vouched for by the facts of political history all the world over how extensive empires have been built on the ruins of many smaller kingdoms comparatively less organised than themselves for purposes of war and military aggression. Bearing this in mind let us approach the detailed study of the Tables and the facts they embody. They throw a flood of light on the political history of that far-off period.

by the more productive agriculture while the subsistence of a nomad requires 100 to 200 acres of land, for that of a skilful farmer from 1 to 2 acres suffice.'' (p. 61.)

Agricultural Tribes: ''With transition to the sedentary life of agriculture, society makes a further gain over nomadism in the close integration of its social units, due to permanent residence in larger and more complex groups; in the continuous release of labour from the task of mere food-getting for higher activities, resulting especially in the rapid evolution of the home and finally in the more elaborate organisation in the use of the land, leading to economic differentiation of different localities and to a rapid increase in the population supported by a given area, so that the land becomes the dominant cohesive force in society.'' (pp. 61-62.)

(1) This later name may perhaps be a corruption of 'Taṇporunai', the cool *Porunai*. The name 'Porunai' (meaning that which resembles) may itself be taken as a part of the fuller name 'Ān-Porunai' that which resembles a cow.

THE FIRST GENERATION.

Veliyan Tittan Period.

The Chola line: Veliyan Tittan.

19. Veḷiyan Tittan, the captor of Uṟaiyūr and the founder of the Chōḻa power, was one of the many Vēḷs or kings, who occupied territories near the coast in the basin of the river Kāviri (the modern Kāvēri). Like the predecessors of Aḻuntūrvēḷ and Nāṅkūrvēḷ, he was the Vēḷ or king of Vīrai, a coast town near the Kāvēri delta. As I could not get contemporary poets for this earliest period, I had to piece together the references contained in the stanzas of some of the earliest poets and bring out a fairly connected narrative of the times. Mutukūṟṟanār, or as some manuscripts have it Mutukūttanār, sings as follows about this ruler of Vīrai in stanza 58 of *Naṟṟiṇai*:

> "பெறுமுது செல்வர் பொன்னுடைப் புதல்வர்
> சிறுதோட் கோத்த செவ்வரிப் பறையின்
> கண்ணகத் தெழுதிய குரீஇப் போலக்
> கோல் கொண் டலைப்பப் படீஇயர் மாதோ
> வீரை வேண்மான் வெளியன் தித்தன்
> முரசுமுதற் கொளீஇய மாலை விளக்கின்"

We understand from this that Tittan was merely a Vēḷmān[1] of Vīrai with no pretensions to the style and insignia of a great Chōḻa sovereign at that time. The term Vēḷmān signifies Vēḷmagan, one belonging to the community of Vēḷ and also its king or ruler by pre-eminence. We may justly presume that he must have had under him a number of Kiḻārs or Kiḻavars holding subordinate authority and in charge of different villages.[2] Tittan's capital

(1) *Vide* Appendix V: Note on the Tamiḻ Suffix *Mān*.

(2) The Primitive Tamiḻs consisted of a number of village communities each under the headship of a Kiḻān or Kiḻar, the abbreviated forms of the fuller name Kiḻavan or Kiḻavar. These terms refer to the persons who had the right of being the headmen or chiefs of their respective village-communities, composed of a single family and its numerous branches. A confederacy of such communities was presided over by a Vēḷ or Vēḷmān.

being Vīrai, near the coast, he had no connection with Uṟaiyūr, an inland town. That Vīrai was on the sea-coast can be made out from the lines of Marutan Iḷanāganār, a later poet in *Aganānūṟu*, S. 206:

> "அடுபோர் வேளிர் வீரை முன்றுறை
> நெடுவெள் ளுப்பின் நிரம்பாக் குப்பை"

The poet here describes the salt pans of Vīrai. Now this Veḷiyan Tittan, probably more ambitious than his brother Vēḷs of his time, conceived the plan of extending his dominions inland. He seems to have cast his eye on Uṟaiyūr, then in possession of a ruler named Sēndan, probably the son of Aḻisi whom we have already alluded to as the sovereign of Ārkkāḍu. Sēndan succeeding his father on the throne of Ārkkāḍu must have extended his kingdom to Uṟaiyūr. Whatever may be our opinion about Sēndan getting the Uṟaiyūr principality by inheritance or by right of conquest, there can scarcely be any doubt about his occupation of that city. Here is a stanza from *Kuṟuntogai* (stanza 258) by Poet Paraṇar giving us the information:

> "வாரலெஞ் சேரி தாரநின் றாரோ
> யலரா கின்றாற் பெரும காவிரிப்
> பலராடு பெருந்துறை மருதொடு பிணித்த
> வேந்துகோட் டியானைச் சேந்த னுறந்தை
> யரியரி லம்புக விளங்கோட் டுவேட்டை
> நிரைய வொள்வா ளிளையர் பெருமக
> னழிசி யார்க்காடன்ன விவள்
> பழிதீர் மாணலம் தொலைதன கண்டே"

Here, the Poet, in the hypothetical love-scene imagined and described by him introduces the maiden-companion of the heroine as forbidding the lover from further advance in his overtures to her lady. In requesting the lover not to visit their village or to send any more of his garlands as tokens of love, the maid appeals to the finer feelings of the gallant by the imagery that the faultless beauty of her lady too joins in the supplication for

the discontinuance of his visits as they give rise to unfavourable comments of the whole neighbourhood and cause no little annoyance to the lady besides despoiling her of all her beauty. Thus not only the maid but the lady's beauty also has been dexterously woven into the lines as craving for protection. In the ideal scene thus depicted the poet following the conventions of the Tami̱l bards of that age, introduces two similes to illustrate the faultless beauty of his heroine. The capital of some ruler or other is generally brought in by the poet as the object to whose splendours the richness of his heroine's beauty should be compared. Here Paraṇar, not content with one capital, refers to two cities, Uṟantai of Sēndan, on the banks of the Kāvēri, and Ārakkāḍu of Aḻisi, probably to heighten the loveliness of his heroine. Poetic idealisation apart, the poet's reference to Uṟantai of Sēndan gives us a veritable bit of history. We further know that neither Sēndan nor his father Aḻisi comes under the line of the Chōḻa sovereigns of Uṟantai. In all probability, Aḻisi was the chief of the forest tribe, the original stock from which the Tiraiyars or Toṇḍaiyars of later times took their rise. They are called 'Basarnagos"[1] by Ptolemy, who locates them just to the north of the territory occupied by the 'Sornagos' or Chōḻas. Sēndan, not a Chōḻa king himself, is thus described to have been in possession of Uṟaiyūr for some time, and Veḷiyan Tittan, the ruler who actually founded the Chōḻa line of sovereigns and launched it on a career of conquest and expansion, was then confined to Vīrai, the coast town. Fired with ambition this Tittan seems to have dislodged Sēndan from Uṟantai and established himself there. Having secured the coveted prize, he planned and carried out the fortification of Uṟantai and made it impregnable for ordinary assaults. These

(1) If any conjecture might be offered the name 'Basarnagos' given by Ptolemy may be Pasalai Nāgar (பசலை நாகர்). Both பசலை and நாகு mean the tender shoot or leaf of a plant, probably giving us an insight into the origin of the Sanskrit name Pallava of later days.

facts are deducible from the following references in the stanzas of some of the earliest[1] poets, Paraṇar and Mutukūṟṟanār.

> "நொச்சி வேலித் தித்த னுறந்தைக்
> கன்முதிர் புறங்காட் டன்ன"
>
> —Paraṇar in *Agam.*, S. 122.

> "வென்றெறி முரசின் விறற்போர்ச் சோழ
> ரின்கடுங் கள்ளி னுறந்தை யாங்கண்".
>
> —Mutukūṟṟanār in *Agam.*, S. 137.

These extracts testify that Veḷiyan Tittan had later on come into the possession of Uṟantai. Not content with this conquest he or some one connected with him appears to have carried war into the heart of Sēndan's territory, the old capital Ārkkaḍu, and completely annexed the Arcot[2] territory to his own. The testimony of the poetess Nakkaṇṇai, whom I take to be the Nakkaṇṇai, daughter of Peruṅkōḷi Nāikan, and who appears in the next generation, is decisive on the point. Following closely the generation of Veḷiyan Tittan, she describes Ārkkāḍu as belonging to the Chōḻas. The line—

> "வெல்போர்ச் சோழ ரழிசியம் பெருங்காட்டு"
>
> —*Naṟṟiṇai,* S. 87.

shows that Veḷiyan Tittan's victory over Sēndan not only cost him the loss of Uṟantai but paved the way for the annexation of his whole kingdom including the old capital either during Veḷiyan Tittan's time or in that of his immediate successor. Thus we are forced to conclude that the Chōḻas of Uṟantai had to build up their kingdom on

(1) The reign of Karikālan the Great is a landmark in the history of this early period. Like a luminous band stretching almost in the middle it serves to divide the incidents and personages of that far-off epoch into two batches, the earlier and the later. The so-called "Sangam" poets who precede this Karikālan I herein name as the earlier and the post-Karikālan poets, the later.

(2) Sēndamaṅgalam in South Arcot District, though a later name, may be held as testifying to Sēndan's connection with that region in ancient times.

the ruins of the Arcot power. It is true that the texts of the early poets do not give us a connected and circumstantial narrative of this conquest—and they were precluded from doing so for the simple reason that they were not professional historians and their duty mainly consisted in off and on panegyrizing their royal patrons—but this need not deter us from putting together the apparently disconnected facts and drawing therefrom the only inference that could rationalise them. It is only by justly disposing these stray facts in their true order of sequence in time can we get at their significance and create a more or less understandable picture of the happenings in a closed chapter of ancient Tamil history. Here the disconnected facts are that the first king of the Chōḻa line went by the name of Vīrai Vēḷmān Veḷiyan Tittan and that his capital was Vīrai, a coast town, that Uṟaiyūr, the famous capital of the Chōḻas was then in possession of one Sēndan, who had no conceivable connection with the Chōḻa family of kings and that Veḷiyan Tittan seems to have occupied Uṟantai and fortified it. All that I have attempted to do is to place these three facts in their true inter-relation and draw the inference that Sēndan was ousted from Uṟantai by the invading forces of Veḷiyan Tittan, who, thereby, founded the first capital of the Chōḻas and made it an impregnable fortress. Paraṇar's poem in *Agaṉāṉūṟu*, from which I have already quoted a few lines, may be transcribed in full for the relevancy of their closing lines:

"இரும்பிழி மகாஅரிவ் வழுங்கன் மூதூர்
விழவின் றாயினுந் துஞ்சா தாகு
மல்ல லாவண மறுகுடன் மடியின்
வல்லுரைக் கடுஞ்சொ லன்னை துஞ்சாள்
பிணிகோ ளருஞ்சிறை யன்னை துஞ்சிற்
றுஞ்சாக் கண்ணர் காவலர் கடுகுவ
ரிலங்குவே லிளையர் துஞ்சின் வையெயிற்று
வலஞ்சுரித் தோகை ஞாளி மகிழு
மரவவாய் ஞமலி மகிழாது மடியிற்

பகலுரு வுறழ்நிலாக் கான்று விசும்பி
னகல்வாய் மண்டில நின்று விரியும்மே
திங்கள் கல்சேர்பு கனையிருள் மடியி
னில்லெலி வல்சி வல்வாய்க் கூகை
கழுதுவழங் கியாமத் தழிதகக் குழறும்
வளைக்கட் சேவல் வாளாது மடியின்
மனைச்செறி கோழி மாண்குர லியம்பு
மெல்லா மடிந்த காலை யொருநா
ணில்லா நெஞ்சத் தவர்வா ரலரே, யதனா
லரிபெய் புட்டி லார்ப்பப் பரிசிறந்
தாதி போகிய பாய்பரி நன்மா
நொச்சி வேலித் தித்த னுறந்தைக்
கன்முதிர் புறங்காட் டன்ன
பன்முட் டின்றாற் றோழிநங் களவே."

In this beautiful stanza, the poet makes the heroine recount one by one the many obstacles that beset the path of her lover's approach to herself. She winds up the graphic account of the disconcerting impediments by a telling simile that they were as many and as insuperable as the obstructions to an advance on Tittan's fortress at Urantai. From this we may reasonably conclude that immediately after the conquest of Urantai (Uraiyūr), Tittan put its defences in thorough order and made that city impregnable. An ambitious sovereign like himself, with projects of conquest seething in his mind, could not have done anything else.

The Pandiya line unrepresented.

20. It is not possible to trace out a Pāṇḍiya representative for this period for want of literary references. But subsequent texts make it clear that at about this time the Pāṇḍiyas were confined to their capital, Korkai at the mouth of the Tāmraparṇi river, and had not yet even established themselves at Madura, whose earlier name appears to have been Kūḍal. Kūḍal at about this time was probably in possession of one of Akutai's ancestors, his father or grandfather.

21. We have also no means of knowing who the Chēra sovereign was at this period. But one may fairly infer that the Chēra kings were still confined to the West Coast, their initial seat being Kuṭṭanāḍu, the Kottanara of the Greeks, in the western seaboard of North Travancore. They had not yet extended their dominion north and east. They had yet to conquer Karuvūr[1] which later on gave them the most convenient vantage-ground on the basin of the Periyār river for further conquests north and east. But this military expedition to Karuvūr and its annexation probably occurred in the next generation, which I shall discuss in detail later on.

The Chera line unrepresented.

22. Among the chiefs, referred to in the verses of some earlier poets, Sēndan was the only one who could be considered a contemporary of Veḷiyan Tittan. He seems to have been the last of the Arcot line of sovereigns, who was forced to give way before the superior military skill and organizing power of the ruler of Vīrai, Veḷiyan Tittan. Though Tittan is reported to have occupied Uṟantai, his dominion presumably did not embrace the environs of the Kāvēri delta which went by the name of Kaḷār. This part of the country, at the mouth of that fertilising river, should have been in the possession of one Matti or his immediate predecessor, wielding power over the fisher-folk of the coast as their tribal sovereign. Matti comes into prominence in the second generation and his story may therefore be taken up later.

The Chieftains.

Veḷiyan Tittan, the conqueror of Uṟaiyūr, had a son named Tittan Veḷiyan, with whom he seems to have been

(1) Dr. Vincent A. Smith and Kanakasabhai Pillai were at one in holding that the Karuvūr of the ancient Tamil classics is not the modern Karūr in the Trichinopoly District but is represented by the ruined village Tirukkārūr, about 28 miles north-east of Cochin. The testimony of the Greek writers and the early Tamil poets goes to support this view. For a fuller discussion refer to Appendix VI: Note on Karuvūr, the Chēra Capital.

not on good terms. This is hinted at by poet Sāttantaiyār in a stanza celebrating the martial prowess of Tittan Veḷiyan, his contemporary, displayed in a personal contest with Mallan of Āmūr. It runs as follows:—

> "இன்கடுங் கள்ளி னாமூ ராங்கண்
> மைந்துடை மல்லன் மதவலி முருக்கி
> யொருகால் மார்பொதுங் கின்றே யொருகால்
> வருதார் தாங்கிப் பின்னொதுங் கின்றே
> நல்கினு நல்கா னாயினும் வெல்போர்ப்
> பொரலருந் தித்தன் காண்கதி லம்ம
> பசித்துப் பணைமுயலும் யானை போல
> விருதலை யொசிய வெற்றிக்
> களம்புகு மல்லற் கடந்தடு நிலையே"

—*Puram.*, S. 80.

The poet expresses his wish that Veḷiyan's splendid victory over Mallan and the exhibition of his personal valour in the battle-field deserve to be witnessed by Veḷiyan's father, Tittan, the great warrior. In expressing this wish the poet manages to interpolate into his verse the phrase 'நல்கினும் நல்கா னாயினும்' meaning 'whether he is pleased with the feat (and thus brought to relent in his hostile attitude towards his son) or not'. The commentator adds the note in explaining the significance of this phrase that Veḷiyan Tittan and his son were not on amicable terms at that time. If a conjecture might be hazarded from the peculiar relationship between Veḷiyan and the poetess Nakkaṇṇaiyār, the daughter of Peruṅkōḷi[1] Nāikan, the love intrigues of the prince with a daughter of one of his

(1) Uṟaiyūr was also known as Kōḷiyūr or Peruṅkōḷiyūr to distinguish it from Kuṟuṅkōḷiyūr, probably the capital of the Āayi kings, which must have been situated near the southern border of the Coimbatore District. Ptolemy refers to the latter town as 'Adarima Koreour', *i.e.*, Atiyarmā or Atiyarmān Kōḷiyūr. These ancient towns probably took their names from Kōḷi, a banyan tree. Compare with this the name Pērālavāyil which may have been another ancient name like Kūḍal for Madura. These names, in course of time, have given rise to the fanciful myths of the Cock and the Serpent which have stood and still stand in the way of their correct derivation.

commanders, in charge of Kōḷi or Uṟantai, may probably have been at the bottom of the great king's displeasure. But, however that be, there is little doubt that the Chōḷa sovereign who was destined to succeed his father and extend and consolidate his conquests, had to start his career in an atmosphere of parental wrath and misunderstanding. That Veḷiyan Tittan had also a daughter Aiyai (ஐயை) is clear from Paraṇar's reference:

" * * ஐயை தந்தை
மழைவளந் தரூஉ மாவண் டித்தன்
பிண்ட நெல்லி னுறந்தை "

—*Agam.*, S. 6.

but of this princess we know little beside her name.

As no contemporary singers appear to celebrate Veḷiyan Tittan's victories, I had to construct this imperfect account of that early period from the stray allusions culled from a few early poets. The known relationship of Veḷiyan Tittan and Tittan Veḷiyan, the succeeding sovereign in the Chōḷa line, supplies us with a strong linear-link to connect this period with the next.

THE SECOND GENERATION.

TITTAN VELIYAN *alias* PORVAIKKO-PERUNARKILLI PERIOD.

The Chola line: Tittan Veliyan alias Porvaikko-Perunarkilli.

23. The second Chōḷa sovereign of the line was Tittan's son, Veḷiyan, known also as Pōrvaikkō-Perunaṟkiḷḷi (Perunaṟkiḷḷi, the conqueror and king of Pōrvai). Sāttantaiyār and Nakkaṇṇaiyār, two contemporary singers, bestow high praise on him for his famous victory over Mallan of Āmūr, which must have been gained in the lifetime of Veḷiyan's father Tittan. Whether Tittan, before he died, was reconciled to his erring son Veḷiyan or not, the latter appears to have succeeded him on the throne of Uṟantai (Uṟaiyūr). Like Prince Hal, he proved himself a worthy successor of his worthy father,

by his great military talents and organising power. Though in his earlier years he seems to have caused some parental pangs to his aged father, once on the throne of Uraiyūr, he straightway forced the neighbouring chiefs to feel the weight of his arms. His first aggression was directed against Palaiyan, king or Pōr or Pōrvai, a province at the basin of the Kāvēri, near the Coimbatore border of the Trichinopoly District.[1] This Pōr territory was then an independent principality as one can make out from the following lines:—

" * * * வென்வேன்
மாரி யம்பின் மழைத்தோற் பழையன்
காவிரி வைப்பிற் போஒ ரன்னவென்
செறிவளை யுடைத்தலோ விலனே"

—*Agam.*, S. 186.

Later on Palaiyan sinks to the level of a dependent chief to do the bidding of his great Chōla overlord. Paranar's lines:

"இழையணி யானைச் சோழர் மறவன்
கழையளந் தறியாக் காவிரிப் படப்பைப்
புனன்மலி புறவிற் போஒர் கிழவோன்
பழைய னோக்கிய வேல்போற்
பிழையல கண்ணவ ணோக்கியோர் திறத்தே."

—*Agam.*, S. 326.

definitely refer to Palaiyan's becoming a commander under the Chōla king. It might be urged whether Palaiyan could not be assumed as one of Chōla's commanders from the very beginning. Such a supposition hardly explains Veliyan's assumption of the title 'Pōrvaikkō', king of 'Pōrvai' or 'Pōr'. Surely Veliyan's father Tittan was not known under that name. Nor did Veliyan himself assume it at the beginning of his career. One may justly infer from the circumstances that after the occu-

(1) Mahāmahōpādhyāya Pandit V. Swaminatha Aiyar identifies this town as the modern Tiruppūr in the Coimbatore District. But this takes us to the very heart of the Kongu country, which is certainly not warranted by the texts.

pation of Uraiyūr by his father, the son was bent on further conquests towards the West and while carrying them out must have brought the king of Pōr also under subjection. This conquest was merely the opening of a more protracted campaign and on a wider theatre, the Koṅgunāḍu lying to the west of Pōr. Here is the testimony of a poem from *Narriṇai*, the poet's name unfortunately missing, to prove that the Chōḻas had to avail themselves of Paḻaiyan's services in their fight with the Koṅgu tribes in the West:

> "இன்கடுங் கள்ளி னிழையணி நெடுந்தேர்க்
> கொற்றச் சோழர் கொங்கர்ப் பணீஇயர்
> வெண்கோட் டியானைப் போஒர் கிழவோன்
> பழையன் வேல்வாய்த் தன்ன."
>
> —*Narriṇai*, S. 10.

In the war with those tribes, Paḻaiyan with all his bravery could not make any headway. The forest chiefs, probably under the direction of Nannan, a king of the country adjoining the northern-half (Eḻilmalai) of the Western Ghats[1] and whose sway then extended far to the

(1) By a curious parallelism in the change in denotation of certain geographical names of ancient Tamiḻagam, the Eḻilmalai, which once referred to the whole of the Western Ghats to the north of the Coimbatore gap as the 'Pothiyil' referred to the entire range to its south, came later on to be applied to a prominent peak near Cannanore, which now goes by the name of *Mount D'ely*, the name of its southern partner likewise being restricted to the present 'Pothiyil' or Agastiyarkūḍam, to the north of South Travancore. The shifting was very probably due to the political vicissitudes which overtook the rulers of these two hill-kingdoms, by which they had to lose the central portions of the Ghats to the two powerful lines of sovereigns, the Chēras and the Chōḻas on either flank and had had to be satisfied with the last remnants, the northern and southern parts of the Ghats in Tamiḻagam from which also they were subsequently dislodged by the three conquering Tamil kings. Such a line as 'ஏழினெடுவரைப் பாழிச்சிலம்பு' shows conclusively that Pāḻi was a fortified hill belonging to the Eḻil, which is described as a long range of mountains. Eḻil had other hills also, such as, Cheruppu, Pāram, Ayirai, etc. The modern *Mount D'ely* in inheriting this ancient Tamil name has given rise to quite a crop of fanciful derivations, from Sapta Sailam to Rat Mountain. No wonder that Tamil names should thus stand as a riddle even to the most accomplished Sanskritists. The name Eḻil, from the proximate root eḻu (எழு) to rise, means an elevated table-land or

south and even into the Koṅgu country to the east of the Ghats, offered him a stout resistance. Paḻaiyan had to lay down his life in the field of battle which is graphically described by one of the early poets, Kuḍavāyil Kīrattanār in *Agam.*, S. 44:

"நன்ன னேற்றை நறும்பூ ணத்தி
துன்னருங் கடுந்திறற் கங்கன் கட்டி.
பொன்னணி வல்விற் புன்றுறை யென்றாங்
கன்றவர் குழீஇய வளப்பருங் கட்டூர்ப்
பருந்துபடப் பண்ணிப் பழையன் பட்டென"

The coalition of the chiefs, Ēṟṟai, Atti, Kaṅkan, Kaṭṭi, Punṟuṟai, evidently chiefs of the hill and forest tribes inhabiting the Koṅgu land and the northern borders of the Chōḻa country, must have been brought about by Nannan who appears to have held a dominant position in the northern half of the Coimbatore District at that time. The southern portion was then known as Puḷḷunāḍu and was ruled over by Atiyan and Eyinan. Evidently, these names appear to be tribal names and hence may stand for their chiefs. Āayi Eyinan, *i.e.*, the king of the Eyina or Villavar tribe, had his capital at Vākai and enjoyed his independence till Veḷiyan appeared on the scene and annexed his kingdom:

"வென்றெறி முரசின் வேந்த ரென்றும்
வண்கை யெயினன் வாகை யன்ன
இவணலந் தாரா தமைகுவ ரல்லர்."

—*Puram.*, S. 351.

These few lines contain a cryptic account of Eyinan's loss of independence. Āayi Eyinan thenceforward had to hold a subordinate position to the Chōḻa king and become even the commander of his forces, in the battle with Nannan. At the engagement of Pāḻi, however, fates turned

plateau and then the mountain rising from it. The name 'Pothiyil' also may have first meant the low country (the land in the hollow) before it came to signify the mountain region in it. I consider this as a more fundamental derivation than the one suggested by me in an appendix to the book *Agastyā in the Tamil Land.*

against him and he fell in the battle with Migñili, Nannan's commander. Thus Veḷiyan's scheme of conquest in the west received a check for a time. Of the many references to this battle contained in Paraṇar's pieces, I shall content myself with extracting one here:

> "வெளியன் வேண்மா னாஅ யெயின
> னளியியல் வாழ்க்கைப் பாழிப் பறந்தலை
> யிழையணி யானை யியறேர் மிஞிலியொடு
> நண்பக லுற்ற செருவிற் புண்கூர்ந்
> தொள்வாண் மயங்கமர் வீழ்ந்தென."

—*Agam.*, S. 208.

In *Agam.*, stanza 142, however, referring probably to the same battle the name Eyinan is found replaced by Atiyan or Atikan. It may be due to an error in reading or refer to another battle of Pāḻi with Atiyan. Or more probably still both of them may have taken part in that battle. In any case, we can reasonably assume that the incursions of Nannan from the west and of Veḷiyan from the east were hotly contested by the forest chiefs of the Koṅgu country:

> புள்ளிற் கேம மாகிய பெரும்பெயர்
> வெள்ளத் தானை யதிகற் கொன்றுஉ—

These lines from *Agam.*, S. 142 show that the southern portion of the Coimbatore District, then known as Puḷḷunāḍu, was in possession of Atiyan, probably of the Āayi house. It was on account of Nannan's invasion of this territory that the battle of Pāḻi was fought by Eyinan, in which he is said to have lost his life. *Vide* also Paraṇar's lines:

> " * * * கொடித்தேர்ப்
> பொலம்பூ ணன்னன் புன்னாடு கடிந்தென
> யாழிசை மறுகிற் பாழி யாங்க
> ணஞ்ச லென்ற வாஅ யெயின
> னிகலொடு கற்பின் மிஞிலியொடு தாக்கித்தன்
> னுயிர்கொடுத் தனனே."

—*Agam.*, S. 396.

As the stray allusions contained in the stanzas of Paraṇar are the only source of information about this early time, the picture of events cannot but be fragmentary.

Kaḻār, the territory covered by the Kāvēri delta, was then in possession of one Matti, the tribal chief of the Paratavars or fishermen of the coast. Paraṇar refers to him in the lines:

> " வல்வில் லெறுழ்த்தோட் பரதவர் கோமான்
> பல்வேல் மத்தி கழாஅர் முன்றுறை."
>
> —*Agam.*, S. 226.

He too seems to have been conquered and his territory annexed by Veḷiyan or by another Chōḻa leader of that community. That Veḷiyan became the lord of a part of the coast territory also can be inferred from Paraṇar's description:

> " சினங்கெழு தானைத் தித்தன் வெளிய
> னிரங்குநீர்ப் பரப்பிற் கானலம் பெருந்துறை."
>
> —*Agam.*, S. 153.

The picture of Veḷiyan's fame and military exploits will not be complete without the following incident narrated by the poet in a life-like manner, how Kaṭṭi, a forest chieftain, who came for a fight with Veḷiyan, lost his nerve and took to his heels at the sound of even the peace music at Veḷiyan's durbar at Urantai. Here is the graphic description:

> வலமிகு முன்பிற் பாணனொடு மலிதார்த்
> தித்தன் வெளிய னுறந்தை நாளவைப்
> பாடின் றெண்கிணைப் பாடுகேட் டஞ்சி
> போரடு தானைக் கட்டி
> பொராஅ தோடிய வார்ப்பினும் பெரிதே.
>
> —*Agam.*, S. 220.

Through this overlaid poetic picture the martial glory of Veḷiyan still shines for us. Nevertheless one would be justified in concluding from the attempted attack by Kaṭṭi, a petty forest chief, that Veḷiyan could not then have ruled

over an extensive dominion and been a full-blown sovereign like his successors of the post-Karikālan age.

The Pandiya and the Chera Kings.

24. Who the Pāṇḍiya king was at that time, we have absolutely no means of knowing. As regards the Chēra line, I insert tentatively within square brackets the name of apparently one of the earliest rulers of that family. Karuvūr-Ēṟiya-oḷ-vāḷ-kō-Peruñcēral Irumpoṟai, the great Chēra king with the shining sword, who conquered and occupied Karuvūr and was thenceforward known as Irumpoṟai.[1] He was the first sovereign to launch the Chēra line on a career of conquest. Before his time that royal house must have been confined to the coast country of Kuṭṭanāḍu (roughly North Travancore to the south of the Periyār river) with Kuḷumūr[2] for its capital. Beyond this to the north lay Kuḍanāḍu at the basin of the river Periyār, known probably also as Perumpaḍappai,[3] the modern Cochin State and its sea-board. Quite likely by the pressure of population in Kuṭṭanāḍu, hemmed in as it was then between Kuḍanāḍu in the north and the Āayi country in the south and the east, the community under the leadership of their ruler over-

(1) The name Irumpoṟai literally means the big mountain and is the exact antonym of Kuṟumpoṟai, the small hill. The signification of this word was extended first to the country and then to its king by a common linguistic usage in Tamil akin to the rhetorical trope, 'synecdoche'. The kings of Kuṭṭanāḍu (the country of lakes and swamps), so long as they were confined to their coast territory, could not assume this title. But the victory over the old ruler of Karuvūr gave them an access into a mountainous region and led them to add thereby a significant title to their names. The first Chēra sovereign who adopted this title should have been this conqueror of Karuvūr.

(2) Whether this name appears in a changed form in 'Kourellour' of Ptolemy, one of the inland towns mentioned as situate between the rivers, the Periyār and the Baris (Pālāyi), should be further looked into.

(3) The Cochin Royal House belongs to the 'Perumpaḍappu' Swarūpam. Paḍappu here is evidently a corruption of Paḍappai which literally means the environ or adjoining land of a river or a hill or a homestead. The terms காவிரிப்படப்பை, பெண்ணைப்படப்பை, occurring in these poems mean the lands at the basin of the river Kāvēri or Peṇṇai. Perumpaḍappai thus refers to the country round about the banks of the river Periyār and the name must have been later on corrupted in popular parlance into 'Perumpaḍappu'.

flowed into Kuḍanāḍu and occupied its capital. Who the king was who was thus dispossessed of Karuvūr it is not possible to make out. Still there are indications to show that Kuḍanāḍu was then in the occupation of a pastoral tribe under a chieftain Erumai, evidently a tribal name appearing in the line of a later-poet—

'நுண்பூ ணெருமை குடநாட் டன்ன'

—*Agam.*, S. 115.

This name, however, should not be confounded with Erumaiūran, the head of a northern tribe living at the basin of the river Ayiri, not certainly the Periyār, whatever other northern river it may denote. Not commanding the Coimbatore Pass, the only way of entrance into the southern-half of the Koṅgu country, the conqueror of Kuḍanāḍu could not have moved his forces into that region, without first subjugating the northern king Nannan whose Pūḻināḍu otherwise known as Koṇkāṇam extended far down to the south as far as that strategic gateway. This powerful sovereign had already led his westerners into the sheltered land of the Coimbatore District and occupied at least its northern portion. We found him engaged in serious conflict with the forest tribes of South Coimbatore. The Chēras had not yet penetrated the Koṅgu country. They were engaged in consolidating their conquests near the Periyār basin. Southern Coimbatore known as Puḷḷunāḍu was then occupied by certain hill and forest tribes known as the Āyars, the Eyinars, etc. Congeries of such primitive tribes as the Koṅgars[1] on the west coast together with the Aruvāḷars and the Malavars on the east, who were also of the same extraction, form-

(1) The origin and characteristics of this tribe are involved in much obscurity. If language alone could throw any light, this tribe must be assumed to have immigrated into Coimbatore from the Mysore plateau and the adjoining western sea-board, known then as Koṇkāṇam, comprising roughly the Malabar and Canara Districts. The terms *Koṇ, Koṇku, Koṇḍu* may probably have originally signified the high table-land held between the Eastern and the Western Ghats, which meet near the Nilgiris somewhat close to the western sea. Hence the strip of the western littoral adjoining Koṇ or Koṇku may have been called Koṇkāṇam. The names of

ed an impenetrable zone of protection both to the Chōla and the Chēra kings of the Tamil land from the incursions of the northern powers.[1] The Kurumbars, an allied tribe, also came in as a wedge between the Chēra kingdom of the west and the Chōla power in the east, and if early Tamil literature testifies to anything, their country, the Koṅgu land, should have been the theatre of incessant warfare among the three aggressive Tamil potentates. The arrival of the Chēras near the basin of the river Periyār brought them nearer to this battle-ground.

I enter in this generation the name of Karuvūr-Ēṟiya-Kō-Peruñcēral-Irumporai, first because the insertion keeps in line with the historical events as disclosed in *Patiṟṟuppattu* and in a way unifies the double-line of Chēra sovereigns whose achievements are therein sung about and secondly because it accords with the definite testimony of Ptolemy himself. By the time of this last writer, Karuvūr had become the capital of the Chēras and it is impossible, in the light of the account given by *Patiṟṟuppattu*, to credit any of its eight kings with the exploit of the annexation of Karuvūr. In fact, at least the Irumporai branch of the Chēra family seems to have been well established in that capital ever since the time of Antuvan Chēral. This would justify the inference that the father and predecessor of Antuvan Chēral and Udiyan

the coast tribes and their chiefs Koṇkar and Koṇkan may thus have arisen from the place-name Koṇku. Koṅgar may then be taken as referring to the whole body of coast and highland tribes who had moved inland and to the lowland by over-population in their original seats or by sheer pressure of incursion from the north. As Koṇkānam was corrupted into Koṅgaṇam in the mouth of the people, the name Koṇkar too may have assumed the popular form Koṅgar before it reached the hands of the early poets. In this view, the term Koṅgar (a tribal name derived from their habitat) must be held as bearing on its face the impress of greater popular currency than the names Koṇkan and Koṇkānam preserved in literature.

(1) Mr. F. J. Richards writes in his *Salem Manual*, p. 45, as follows:—"The Southernmost Mauryan inscription is at Siddāpur, in the Chitaldrug District of Mysore, and between the Mauryan Empire and the Dravidian Kingdoms a broad belt of forest intervened. It is possible, therefore, that in the Mauryan period Salem District was covered with primeval jungle. If it were worth claiming, it must have belonged to Chēra or Chōla."

Chēral should have been the conqueror of Karuvūr and that he should be identified with the Chēra king, the hero of the missing first decad of *Patiṟṟuppattu.* The conquest of Kuḍanāḍ and the occupation of its capital Karuvūr being a land-mark in the history of the Chēras, the collector of the poems comprising *Patiṟṟuppattu* may be held to have assigned the place of honour in that collection to the decad celebrating the conqueror of Karuvūr. Cogent as these reasons are for bringing in the conqueror of Karuvūr in this generation, still as the insertion stands unsupported by a link-name, I have distinctly marked it with square brackets.

All that goes to commemorate the military feats of this Chēra king, Karuvūr-Ēṟiya-Kō-Peruñcēral-Irumpoṟai, is only a solitary stanza of poet Nariveruttalaiyār[1]

(1) I am myself loath to translate proper names, such as this, of persons, who lived some twenty centuries since, especially because we have not yet got the key to their correct interpretation. At present, almost all persons in Dravidian India take the name of some God or Goddess of the Aryan pantheon. Still some writers evince a tendency to translate these practically non-significant personal-names in Tamil Literature as if by so doing they could get nearer their right interpretation, which if at all practicable should proceed on the correct appreciation of the conditions of those times which had made such names possible. Instead of throwing any additional light on the matter, their procedure only makes the whole look bizarre and ridiculous to our modern ideas, beliefs and tastes. Taking, for instance, the name 'Smith', what conceivable purpose would it serve to trace it to one who followed a smith's profession at a far-off time in the past? Mental associations work in such diverse and unexpected fashions in the matter of naming an object or person that even trained Psychologists can scarcely hope to reach the bottom here. Nariveruttalaiyār may literally mean either one who lived in a village called Nariveruttalai or one who belonged to a family called Nariveruttalai or one who possessed a head which did or could frighten foxes, or one who, if later methods of nomenclature were current at that time, had taken his name from a deity known as Nariveruttalai. In any case, it is a hopeless attempt to translate many of these old-world names with a view to pierce into the mystery of their significance. What havoc has been played with ancient South Indian geography by the craze of the early Aryan colonists and their followers, in the translation of proper names of mountains, rivers, cities, etc., is indeed another story. Mr. J. D. Anderson writes thus in pp. 53 and 54 of his book *Peoples of India*:—"Indigenous names are frequently sanskritised much as we turn French *chaussee* into "Causeway". Sometimes the change is so complete that the original cannot be identified. In some cases the alteration is easily recognised. In northern Bengal, for instance, is the

(*Puram.*, S. 5) in which the king is exhorted to hold a parental rule over his subjects.

The editorial note appended to the stanza evidently imports a miraculous occurrence characteristic of a later age and stands to this day a veritable conundrum for scholars to solve.

The Chiefs. Paḻaiyan of Pōr, Eyinan of Vākai, Matti of Kaḻār, Nannan I with his numerous forest chiefs, Ērṟai, Atti, Kaṅkan, Kaṭṭi, and Punṟuṟai, all appear in this generation.

Link-names. Though link-names are absent to connect this generation with the next, *Patiṟṟuppattu* supplies us with a strong link. Nallini, daughter of Tittan Veḷiyan, was married by Udiyan, the Chēra king who appears in the next generation. The latter accordingly stood in the relation of a son-in-law to Veḷiyan, the second Chōḻa sovereign.

THE THIRD GENERATION.

Muḍittalai-Ko-Perunarkilli Period.

The Chola line: (i) Mudittalai-Ko-Perunarkilli. (ii) Karikalan I.

25. The next Chōḻa sovereign was Muḍittalai-Kō-Perunaṟkiḷḷi, *i.e.*, Perunaṟkiḷḷi, the crowned head. He may have assumed this name to distinguish himself from the other Kōs or Vēḷirs not crowned. His relationship with his predecessor though nowhere brought out was in all probability that of a son. According to the Chēra genealogy given in the verses appended to the various sections of *Patiṟṟuppattu,* we find the eight sovereigns therein celebrated falling into two groups of five and three, the five deriving their descent from Udiyan Chēral and the three from Antuvan Chēral Irumporai. In that incomplete work, these

river *Ti-stā,* a name which belongs to a large group of Tibeto-Burman river names beginning with *Ti* or *Di,* such as *Ti-pai, Di-bru, Di-kho, Di-sang,* etc., etc. Hindus say the name *Ti-sta* is either a corruption of Sanskrit *Tri-srotis,* "having three streams" or of Tṛṣṇa, "thirst". Etymology and legend, in fact, give but doubtful guidance to the ethnologist, etc."

two collateral lines now stand wholly disconnected. If the missing first 'Ten' of *Patirruppattu* could be restored, it would doubtless throw some necessary light and bring about the connection we now miss. In the absence of such direct testimony, I have been led from the attendant facts and circumstances to consider the great conqueror of Karuvūr as the stem from which both these branches have sprung. Both Antuvan Chēral Irumporai and Udiyan Chēral lived in one and the same generation and come into line with Mudittalai-Kō-Perunarkilli, the Chōla king, certainly the successor and probably the son of Veliyan of the second generation.

Poet Ēniccēri Mudamōsiyār serves as a lateral link, connecting Mudittalai-Kō-Perunarkilli and Antuvan Chēral Irumporai, about both of whom as meeting at Karuvūr, he has left a record in a *Puranānūru* stanza. Udiyan Chēral, the other Chēra king, is said to have married Princess Nallini, daughter of Veliyan. Circumstances such as these warrant the inference that Mudittalai-Kō-Perunarkilli succeeded his father in due course, on the throne of Uraiyūr, and that he was a brother-in-law to Udiyan Chēral.

This relationship apart, so perfectly do the subsequent generations of the Chēra kings fit in with the facts concerning the other royal houses of the period, as disclosed in the Tables, that I have not the least doubt that *Patirruppattu,* in spite of its redaction by a later hand, still contains facts of authentic history which are worthy of our general acceptance.

Of Mudittalai-Kō-Perunarkilli, we know nothing except the meagre fact of his adventure into Karuvūr in rather peculiar circumstances. Probably the Chōla king wanted to pay a visit to his brother-in-law's brother or cousin, Antuvan Chēral Irumporai, and journeyed to Karuvūr riding on an elephant and followed by his retinue of officers and domestics. While nearing Karuvūr,

the elephant, in one of its periodical ruts, seems to have got out of control and entered Karuvūr with the helpless king on its back. The poet, Eṇiccēri Muḍamōsiyār, who would in all likelihood have preceded his sovereign to convey to Antuvan Chēral the news of the intended visit and who was with the Chēra king at that time, extemporizes a poem on the incident and prays fervently that his royal master should not come to grief.

"இவனியா ரென்குவை யாயி னிவனே
புலிநிறக் கவசம் பூம்பொறி சிதைய
வெய்கணை கிழித்த பகட்டெழின் மார்பின்
மறலி யன்ன களிற்றுமிசை யோனே
களிறே, முந்நீர் வழங்கு நாவாய் போலவும்
பன்மீ னாப்பட் டிங்கள் போலவுஞ்
சுறவினத் தன்ன வாளோர் மொய்ப்ப
மரீஇயோ ரறியாது மைந்துபட் டன்றே
நோயில னாகிப் பெயர்கதி லம்ம
பழன மஞ்ஞை யுகுத்த பீலி
கழனி யுழவர் சூட்டொடு தொகுக்குங்
கொழுமீன் விளைந்த கள்ளின்
விழுநீர் வேலி நாடுகிழ வோனே."

—*Puṟam.*, S. 13.

I have given the stanza here in full, especially in view of the vast superstructure of deductions built upon a misinterpretation of it by Pandit R. Raghava Ayyangar. The learned Pandit argues from the circumstances in which this particular piece is said to have been composed that Karuvūr should have been close to Uraiyūr. He imagines that the Chōḷa king went about his kingdom riding on his elephant when it rutted and took him to Karuvūr against his will. He imagines further that the whole of his armed retinue followed him from the boundary of his kingdom all the distance to Karuvūr, without rendering any assistance to bring the animal under control. The poet is further represented to have played the rôle of a peace-maker and to have interceded with the Chēra king and allayed his fears of an invasion of his kingdom by the

timely interpretation of Chōḻa's entry into the Karuvūr kingdom as due to mere misadventure and not a military expedition. The piling up of such improbabilities is entirely due to the missing of the exact situation in which the poet had to compose his verse. Moreover, in the interpretation of a poem, straining too much at words to evolve their literal meaning is the surest way to miss the poet's mark. Neither good Poetry nor good History could be thus got at. I have gone into this digression for showing that the stanza has not the least bearing on the location of Karuvūr, whether near or far, from the Chōḻa frontier.

A comparison of the names of the first three Chōḻa sovereigns whom we have thus far brought into the Tables does in itself open a fresh point of view *re* the origin of the Chōḻa kingship. It shows, in as clear a manner as possible, the successive stages passed by the Chōḻas before they attained the rank of a crowned sovereign. The first ruler, the conqueror of Uṟaiyūr, was merely a Vēḷmān of Vīrai; his son and successor assumed the title of Kō and was known as Pōrvaikkō, the king of the Pōr country; and the third in the line advanced a step further and adopted the still higher title, 'Muḍittalai Kō', the crowned king. This last fact alone will entitle one to infer that the first two Chōḻa sovereigns of the Tables did not wear the crown, the emblem of full-blown sovereign power. Though in actuality they must have been holding sway over a fairly good extent of territory, probably they were still closely wedded to the older ideal of communalistic kingship and its ways. The bearing, in any view, of these early facts on the origin of the Chōḻa kings and their significance can hardly be underrated.

Another Chōḻa king by name Karikālan appears in this generation to have held his court at Aḻundūr and later on at Kuḍavāyil also in the Tanjore District. Whether the present town Kumbakōṇam or Kuḍavāsal in the Nannilam taluq represents that ancient capital, it is difficult to say.

It is more than likely that while Tittan of Vīrai, conquered Urantai, another Vēlmān of Alundūr[1] may have established himself at Kudavāyil and pushed the Chōla conquests towards the north. The Urantai family must have been then known as the 'Killi' and the Alundūr branch, the 'Chenni'. The exact nature of the relationship of these two branches cannot be known at present. However, from the invariable practice of the early poets referring to Chōlar (சோழர்), a plural name denoting the Chōla community or its rulers, we may consider that the Chōlas at the very beginning lived under a number of communal heads and had not yet got the unitary type of kingship of a later day. The Urantai or Killi family went on expanding the kingdom to the west and the Alundūr or Chenni branch, confined to the coast, pushed its conquests to the north. The annexation of Arcot, in all probability, should have been effected by the latter family of rulers. At the beginning, the two branches may have maintained the most amicable relations or even acted in consort; but, when their kingdoms expanded and territorial kingship began to replace communal rulership, rivalries must have sprung up and brought them into conflict. The dispute, which according to tradition occurred later on about the succession of Karikālan the Great to the Chōla throne, and the disputes, which arose again after the death of that sovereign as testified to by literature, are wholly explainable in the light of these earlier facts of their family history. During the time of Chētcenni Nalankilli, the successor of Karikālan II, whom we may call Karikālan the Great, on account of his great conquests and consolidation of the Chōla Empire, these two names were actually assumed by one and the same ruler probably owing to the merging of the two kingdoms brought about in the time

(1) This name appears in the contracted form as Alundai (அழுந்தை) and may be a variant of Alumbil (அழும்பில்), referred to in S. 44 of *Agananūru*. Poets refer to two other cities known as Alumbil, one in the Chēra and the other in the Pāndiya kingdom. The Alumbil of the Chēra kingdom known also as Alumbur may most probably be the town noted by Ptolemy as 'Arembour'.

of Karikālan the Great or his father and enforced further, after his death, by the intervention of the mighty Chēra monarch, Vēlkelu Kuṭṭuvan. The two names 'Kiḷḷi' and 'Chenni' ever since that time have become almost synonymous and have been used indifferently to denote the Chōḻa king. This later use, however, should not lead us to confound the names in the verses of pre-Karikāl poets. For instance, Poet Paraṇar, in comparing the beauty of his heroine's tresses to the magnificence of three capital cities, refers to 'Chenni', as 'Chirukōl Chenni', *i.e.,* Chenni who ruled a small kingdom.

"வீளை யம்பின் வில்லோர் பெருமகன்
பூந்தோள் யாப்பின் மிஞிலி காக்கும்
பாரத் தன்ன வார மார்பிற்
சிறுகோற் சென்னி யாரேற் றன்ன
மாரி வண்மகி ழோரி கொல்லிக்
கலிமயிற் கலாவத் தன்னவிவ
ளொலிமென் கூந்த னம்வயி னானே."

—*Naṟṟiṇai,* S. 265.

Doubtless here the poet refers to a period when Karikālan I, or another chief of the same family, had only a small extent of territory in his possession. This description will hardly be in keeping with the superior position of the Chōḻas of the 'Kiḷḷi' branch at that time nor with our later conception that the Chōḻa Empire began from the very start with an extensive dominion to its credit. It would be instructive to compare with this, this other verse from *Naṟṟiṇai* wherein the so-called chieftains are described as 'two great kings'.

"அன்னியும் பெரிய னவனும் விழுமிய
விருபெரு வேந்தர் பொருகளத் தொழித்த
புன்னை விழுமம் போல"

—*Naṟṟiṇai,* S. 180.

Whatever it be, the first sovereign in the Chenni line who widened the frontiers of the Chōḻa monarchy seems to be Karikālan I, known also Perum-Pūṇ-Chenni.

Here I have to point out the great confusion that has resulted from a mistaken identity brought about between the two Karikālans, appearing in this literature, in all probability the grandfather and the grandson. Paraṇar, who sings of the two immediate predecessors of Karikālan the Great or Karikālan II alludes in many of his stanzas to a Karikālan of an earlier time. Paraṇar himself was not a contemporary of Karikālan the Great and has not sung a single stanza in his honour. The references incidentally occurring in some of his poems are all about an afore-time Karikālan who was not living in his time and whose achievements he seems to have celebrated from mere tradition or hearsay current in his days. This interesting discovery naturally led me to scrutinize the texts further and see whether the recorded biographical incidents of the two personages should be held apart or according to later interpretation ascribed to one character. As a result of this investigation there emerge two Karikālans one preceding and the other succeeding Paraṇar and that they could properly be distinguished from each other by their distinct acts and achievements. The battles fought and victories won by the first Karikālan stand altogether apart from those of his later and more illustrious namesake. Not one of the numerous poets who have sung of the latter has a word to say about any of those earlier victories of the first Karikālan. Their common silence, not broken by even a solitary reference, justifies the inference that the laurels of those first-won contests should go to crown another brow. Poet Kaḻāttalaiyār, whom Paraṇar's contemporary Kapilar himself acknowledges as having lived before his own time, and one Veṇṇi-Kuyattiyār have both sung as contemporaries about the victory of Karikālan I over Peruñchēralātan[1] (பெருஞ்சேரலாதன்) or Peruntōḷātan (பெருந்தோளாதன்) in the battle of Veṇṇi. The memorable incident of the Chēra king receiv-

(1) The names, Peruñchēralātan and Perumtōḷātan, appearing in the manuscripts are unmistakably due to a misreading of the correct form Peruñchōṟṟatan, the sobriquet of Udiyan Chēral famous for his feasts.

ing a wound in his back and of his self-immolation for this blot on his heroism by the practice prevalent then of Sallēkhana or what in Tamil is called வடக்கிருத்தல் (*i.e.*, seating oneself facing the north and thus meeting death by starvation) occurs here. Evidently there was a second battle of Veṇṇi fought by the later Karikālan in the description of which this characteristic incident does not find a place. In the poem, *Porunarāṟṟuppaḍai*, composed by poet Muḍattāmakkaṇṇiyār, the second battle of Veṇṇi is described as follows:—

"இரும்பனம் போந்தைத் தோடுங் கருஞ்சினை
யரவாய் வேம்பி னங்குழைத் தெரியலு
மோங்கிருஞ் சென்னி மேம்பட மிலைந்த
விருபெரு வேந்தரு மொருகளத் தவிய
வெண்ணித் தாக்கிய வெருவரு நோன்றாட்
கண்ணார் கண்ணிக் கரிகால் வளவன்."

Here the battle was against two kings, a Chēra and a Pāṇḍiya, and both of them were wiped out in that engagement. If this were identical with the first battle of Veṇṇi celebrated by Kaḻāttalaiyār and Veṇṇikkuyattiyār, the omission of Pāṇḍiya's death by the earlier poets requires an explanation. Nor is the peculiar manner of Chēra's death, recorded by the earlier singers, even so much as hinted at by Muḍattāmakkaṇṇiyār, who composes a very long poem for the express purpose of describing the victories of Karikālan II in detail. In these circumstances, we have to conclude that there were two battles of Veṇṇi, each with its different combatants and different incidents. Mere similarity of names should not lead us to confound these two battles, especially as it tends to badly dislocate chronology. As a flagrant instance of such distortion I need here point out only how according to the orthodox misidentification we are forced to transport Kaḻāttalaiyār and Veṇṇikkuyattiyār, two very old singers and admittedly predecessors of poet Kapilar, not only to Kapilar's time but much lower down still to the time of Karikālan II. Full two generations intervene between these earlier poets

and the poets who group themselves round Karikālan II and hence by no conceivable manipulation can one effect such a transposition. On the strength of the contemporary testimony of the two poets referred to above, we have to posit the existence of an antecedent Karikālan.[1] The assumption of an earlier Karikālan is all the more necessary by three other incidents in the life of Karikālan I—incidents which have not the least connection with Karikālan II, if his biography, as recounted in the poems of his numerous poetic satellites, is a reliable guide at all in the matter.

Paraṇar refers to two other battles fought by the first Karikālan and also connects his name with another characteristic incident, the accidental drowning and death of Āṭṭan-Atti in the river Kāvēri during a festival. Though Paraṇar narrates Atti's sad loss in a natural, matter-of-fact way, in more than one stanza of his, incredible myths have gathered round it in course of time so much so that the poor dancer Atti and his wife Ātimanti, who went mad by her terrible bereavement, are now presented to us in the transfigured light of royal personages.

Coming to the battles, here is a short account of the battle of Veṇṇivāyil:

"காய்சின மொய்ம்பிற் பெரும்பெயர் கரிகா
லார்கலி நறவின் வெண்ணி வாயிற்
சீர்கெழு மன்னர் மறலிய ஞாட்பி
னிமிழிசை முரசம் பொருகளத் தொழிய
பதினொரு வேளிரொடு வேந்தர் சாய
மொய்வலி யறுத்த ஞான்றைத்
தொய்யா வழுந்தூ ரார்ப்பினும் பெரிதே."

—*Agam.*, S. 246.

Whether Veṇṇivāyil is the same as Veṇṇi or Veṇṇil before referred to need not be considered here. Here we are given a different set of opponents. Eleven

(1) In the notes appended to stanzas 65 and 66 of *Puṟanāṉūṟu*, the redactor has evidently confounded the earlier Karikālan with his later namesake by the identity of the name Karikāl Vaḷavan borne by both the rulers.

Vēḷirs and kings are distinctly mentioned. In another battle Vākai, nine kings are said to have been routed by him:

> "பெருவளக் கரிகால் முன்னிலைச் செல்லார்
> சூடா வாகைப் பறந்தலை யாடுபெற
> வொன்பது குடையு நன்பக லொழித்த
> பீடின் மன்னர் போல
> வோடுவை மன்னால் வாடைநீ யெமக்கே."
>
> —*Agam.*, S. 125.

These battles find no mention in the elaborate poems of the later singers, who would not have passed them over, had such victories been really won by their patron, Karikālan the Great. Furthermore, the Chōḻa king being forced to fight eleven Vēḷirs and kings in one field, and nine kings in another, gives us a picture of events of an anterior time in which the Chōḻa power was just in the making and had not yet developed into full-blown sovereignty as at the time of Karikālan the Great. No doubt, the latter too had to fight against Aruvāḷars and Poduvars; but the necessity of warring against Vēḷirs of his own class had been long past by his time. In the case of the earlier Karikālan, however, it is more than likely that some Vēḷirs themselves would have been stirred by jealousy when one of their number should try to go ahead by fresh territorial conquests and have sought the earliest opportunity to contest with him for power. But this class rivalry and jealousy would be active only during the infantile period of the new power. After this had grown into maturity and established its claims, naturally one should expect such class feelings to wane and disappear. Such feelings, even had they existed, would have been replaced, in course of time, by others of a different cast, while the Vēḷirs themselves would have taken a pride that one of their own class had founded a kingdom and readily owned allegiance to him. In this view, it would be absolutely incongruous to try to graft these occurrences of an anterior period on the life of Karikālan the Great, who had on no

account to face such miscellaneous foes as his ancestor. Another fairly decisive ground also must be urged here. If these Tables are of any value, they prove beyond a doubt that there was no Chēra sovereign by name பெருஞ்சேரலாதன் or பெருஞ்சோளாதன் either during the time of Karikālan the Great or of his immediate predecessor or immediate successor. By no conceivable process can we twist the names of any of the Chēras of that time to give us a sovereign with this particular name. From considerations such as these I am inclined to hold that the postulation of an earlier Karikālan is something more than a mere hypothesis—nay it must be received as an authentic fact in the ancient history of the Chōlas. Here is certainly an instance how posterity has come to lose sight of an ancient historical hero and it is wholly due to the circumstance that genuine historical facts embedded in literary texts have been somehow either overlooked or misinterpreted.

That Karikāl I belonged to the Alundūr family of the Chōlas we may infer from Paraṇar's lines in *Agam.*. S. 246 already quoted in p. 93. The sad incident which befell Anni Migñili[1] by her father's two eyes having been put out by the fierce Kōsars, evidently the soldiers in the employ of Titiyan, the commander of the Chōla king Karikālan I, and her wreaking vengeance on them by appealing to Titiyan seem to have taken place in Alundūr, the head-quarters of the Chenni branch of the royal family:

"* * * தந்தை
கண்கவி னழித்ததன் றப்பற் றெறாவர
வொன்றுமொழிக் கோசர்க் கொன்றுமுரண் போகிய
கடுந்தேர்த் திதிய னழுந்தைக் கொடுங்குழை
யன்னி மிஞிலியி னியலும்."

—*Agam.*, S. 196.

These lines of Paraṇar narrate that interesting episode.

(1) Pandit Narayanaswami Aiyar, Editor of *Narriṇai*, has given a confused and incorrect version of this incident in his introduction to that work. (*Vide* p. 86.)

This family, as distinguished from the Uṟantai family of Chōḻas, carried out their territorial expansion as already stated along the coast and to the north towards the Pālār basin and beyond. Their portion of the kingdom was known as Neytalaṅkānal, *i.e.*, the region of the sea-board from the mouth of the Kāvēri northwards. There need scarcely be any doubt that when the Chōḻas, who had been living till then as village communities under their Kilārs or chiefs, in the Tanjore District, began to expand their territories west and north, they did so under different leaders. That these leaders themselves may have been related to one another is probable enough; but this assumption should not lead to the mistaken supposition that all the Vēḷirs of that period were under the sway of one monarch. No doubt that unitary type of kingship was founded later on; but in the times we are dealing with—times in which the Chōḻa monarchy was still being hammered into shape—we have no right to assume the central authority being vested in one ruler or sovereign. At best, all that we can assume is a confederacy of communal rulers or *Kōs* bound together by ties of blood or relationship. The failure to reach this point of view has in fact created a linguistic problem for the Tamil grammarians, in such lines as,

அகுதை தந்தை, யண்ணல் யானை யடுபோர்ச் சோழர்.

—*Agam.*, S. 96.

In explaining away the grammatical irregularity of a singular noun 'Tantai' being followed and referred to by the plural form 'Chōḻar' in this passage, Naccinārkkiniyar assumes that each one of the Chōḻas stood in the relation of a father to Akutai. The absurdity of a girl being the daughter of many or all the individuals of a community seems to have strangely escaped that hair-splitting commentator. The fact is that at that time there were many communal heads who went by their common or group name and the poet who wanted to identify a particular individual of that group adds to his common name a restrictive

epithet thus: 'the Chōḻa king who has Akutai for his daughter'. Even here the use of the plural form 'Chōḻar' for the king requires a justification and that must be found by supposing that royalty then was joint and not individual. At all events, he must be assumed as the executive head of a ruling assembly and not an absolute monarch in himself. There are numerous references to the Chōḻa people, probably different branches of that community, living in different places as Uṟantai, Vallam, Kudantai, Paruvūr and Perumtuṟai. That the term 'Chōḻar' in the plural signified a community at first can be gathered from such verses as the following:

> "   *   *   வெண்வேன்
> மாரி யம்பின் மழைத்தோற் சோழர்
> வில்லீண்டு குறும்பின் வல்லத்துப் புறமிளை
> யாரியர் படையி னுடைக."
>
> —*Agam.*, S. 336.

> "புனிற்றான் றரவி னிளையர் பெருமகன்
> தொகுபோர்ச் சோழர் பொருண்மலி பாக்கத்து
> வழங்க லோவாப் பெருந்துறை."
>
> —*Agam.*, S. 338.

Also that the chiefs belonging to different branches of this community exercised sway over different parts of the country can be inferred from such verses as:

> "எழூஅத் திணிதோட் சோழர் பெருமகன்
> விளங்குபுகழ் நிறுத்த விளம்பெருஞ் சென்னி."
>
> —*Agam.*, S. 375.

> "கடும்பகட் டியானைச் சோழர் மருக
> னெடுங்கதிர் நெல்லின் வல்லங் கிழவோன்."
>
> —*Agam.*, S. 356.

It is most probably on account of such communal kingships that the early references to the Chōḻa rulers happen to contain the plural name to denote the ruler. We have to consider this ruler more as the president or executive head of a republican village community than as a unitary absolute sovereign of a later day.

From the foregoing discussion it must be clear that at the opening period of the Chōḻa history that community was ruled over by a number of communal sovereigns and among them a few, more ambitious and more powerful than the rest, tried to expand their possessions by the conquest of the adjoining territories. Of these, Karikālan I evidently belonged to the Cenni family of Aḻundūr, and Tittan and his descendants to the Kiḷḷi branch of Vīrai and later on of Uṟantai.

Pandiya line: Nedumter-Celiyan (alias) Nedum-celiyan I.

In this generation, the very first Pāṇḍiyan known to literature appears to emerge from the long-continued isolation of that line of rulers at Koṟkai, their capital situated at the mouth of the Porunai, the modern Tāmraparṇi in the Tinnevelly District. We have to remember that Kūḍal, whose site must have been somewhere near modern Madura, was then in the possession of a ruler called Akutai. The only authority for this statement is the reference contained in one of Kapilar's stanzas in *Puṟanāṉūṟu*, stanza 347. Unfortunately the stanza comes to us in a mutilated form by the imperfection of manuscripts; but the relevant lines which help us to picture the vicissitudes of Kūḍal come to us without a flaw and leave no room for doubt:

"மணநாறு மார்பின் மறப்போ ரகுதை
குண்டுநீர் வரைப்பிற் கூடலன்ன
குவையிருங் கூந்தல்."

Knowing the convention widely and almost invariably followed by the early Tamil poets in comparing the beauty of their heroines to the splendour of one or other of the capitals of the rulers of the land, we shall not err in holding that Kūḍal was held by Akutai at that time and was the capital of his state. If it had then been in the possession of the Pāṇḍiyans, as later on it came to be, surely the poet would not have sung in this strain. Though two or three Akutais are alluded to in this literature, it is not at all difficult to identify this particular ruler of Kūḍal.

The references by Paraṇar in the following verses may justly be taken as concerning this earlier occupant of the Kūḍal (Madura) throne:

> " இன்கடுங் கள்ளி னஃதை களிற்றொடு
> நன்கல னீயு நாண்மகி ழிருக்கை
> யவைபுகு பொருநர் பறையி னானாது
> கழறுப வென்பவவன் பெண்டிர்."
>
> —*Agam.*, S. 76.

> " இன்கடுங் களிற்றி னகுதை தந்தை[1]
> வெண்கடைச் சிறுகோ லகவன் மகளிர்
> மடப்பிடிப் பரிசின் மானப்
> பிறிதொன்று குறித்ததவ னெடும்புற நிலையே."
>
> —*Kuṟuntogai*, S. 298.

The description of his hall of audience and the account of his lavishing costly gifts as elephants on the songstresses and actresses visiting his court will hardly be in keeping with Akutai playing any rôle inferior to that of an independent ruler. It was also very likely that this ruler of Kūḍal must have come into conflict with another ruler Evvi I,[2] whose dominions lay somewhere along the coast between the Kāviri and the Vaigai. In this war of aggression Evvi I seems to have lost his life. Poetess Veḷḷerukkilaiyār composes more than one piece on this encounter and bewails Evvi's death in *Puṟam.*, stanzas 233 and 234. Whether Evvi's dominion was annexed by Akutai to his Kūḍal territory as a consequence we are not informed of. But this victory of his against a minor chieftain on the north could hardly save Akutai from the incursions of a more formidable foe from the south. The details of the invasion by the Pāṇḍiya king of Koṟkai are not given; but the incident itself, I am sure, is definitely alluded to by poet

(1) The reading here is certainly corrupt. The words களிற்றின் and தந்தை should be amended as கள்ளின் and தந்த respectively to restore the correctness of the original.

(2) This name too looks like a tribal one. It evidently refers to the chief of the forest tribe Evviyar (எவ்வியர்) literally arrow-shooters or bowmen. Ptolemy assigns a portion of the east coast in this region to "Batoi" or Vedar, a name which probably refers to this community.

Pēralavāyār in *Agam.*, S. 296. This poet was a contemporary of Ollaiyūr-tanta-Pūtappāṇḍiyan of the next generation and his reference to the invasion of Kūḍal by the Pāṇḍiya king of Koṟkai may be taken as an allusion to a past event of memorable importance. We may even consider it as having taken place in the lifetime of the poet himself. The stanza is a very important one for my purpose and so I transcribe it here *in extenso*:

"கோதை யிணர குறுங்காற் காஞ்சிப்
போதவிழ் நறுந்தா தணிந்த கூந்த
லரிமதர் மழைக்கண் மாஅ யோளொடு
நெருநையுங் கமழ்பொழிற் றுஞ்சி யின்றும்
பெருநீர் வையை யவளொ டாடிப்
புலரா மார்பினை வந்துநின் றெம்வயிற்
கரத்தல் கூடுமோ மற்றே பரப்பிற்
பன்மீன் கொள்பவர் முகந்த விப்பி
நாரரி நறவின் மகிழ்நொடை கூட்டும்
பேரிசைக் கொற்கைப் பொருநன் வென்வேற்
கடும்பகட் டியானை நெடுந்தேர்ச் செழியன்
மலைபுரை நெடுநகர்க் கூட னீடிய
மலிதரு கம்பலை போல
வலரா கின்றது பலர்வாய்ப் பட்டே."

—*Agam.*, S. 296.

The situation created by the poet contemplates the snub given to the lover by the maiden-companion of the heroine of the piece. When the lover seeks the aid of the maiden for arranging an interview with the heroine, the maid is made to refuse him that favour by the reason of his amours with another beauty. She roundly takes him to task for his unfaithfulness and impresses the unhappy lover with the many details of what he considered a secret love-adventure of his own. To illustrate how the affair was not after all a secret but the talk and common property of the whole village the maid borrows a telling simile from a recent occurrence—the invasion and occupation of Kūḍal by the Pāṇḍiya king of Koṟkai. She compares the attendant circumstances of the public comment,

the lover's so-called secret amours had caused, to the open talk and publicity consequent on the occupation of Kūḍal by the king of Korkai. There is no doubt that the poet herein took advantage of a recent historical occurrence well known to the whole country and used it to illustrate or embellish a widely-known fact. Here I have to diverge a little and call attention to a point of interpretation of the word நீடிய occurring in this stanza. I take the phrase கூடல் நீடிய as meaning 'who had advanced or come to Kūḍal and occupied it'.[1] It also means 'overstaying beyond a definite period of time' as in:

கோடை நீடிய பைதறு காலை

—*Agam.*, S. 42.

சென்றோர் நீடினர் பெரிதெனத் தங்காது
நம்மினும் விரையு மென்ப

—*Aiṅkuṟunūṟu*, S. 467.

This latter meaning is hardly applicable here. If the phrase were so interpreted, it would leave unexplained why the Pāṇḍiya king of Korkai should come

(1) The words நெடு and நீடு formed from the root நீள் originally meant increase in height, length, size, quantity, distance, duration, etc. The early poets invariably used these words and their derivatives to signify any one of these ideas. The word நீடு, when used to express 'time-excess' such as overstaying, was interpreted as தங்கல் in the sense of தாழ்த்தல் or delay. But unfortunately தங்கல், in later Tamil, got the meaning of mere staying or இருத்தல் and so the word நீடல் too came to be infected with the new meaning 'staying or being in a place'. Evidently this has no connection with the original root-meaning, nor is there a single instance in the old poets of the use of the word in this novel significance. Not only this, here are two lines from a stanza in *Puṟanāṉūṟu*, which confirm the correctness of the interpretation I have here adopted:

தாளிமுதல் நீடிய சிறுநறு முஞ்ஞை
முயல் வந்து கறிக்கும்

Puṟanāṉūṟu, S. 328.

The poet here describes a hare nibbling the leaves of the *Munnai* creeper which had shot its tendrils towards the *Tāḷi* plant, reached it and entwined itself round its stem. The phrase தாளி முதனீடிய, for purposes of interpretation, is exactly on a par with the expression கூடனீடிய and can hardly bear the modern interpretation that the stem of the *Tāḷi* plant should be taken as the habitat of the *Munnai* creeper from its very birth. This instance must serve to teach how careful we should be not to import any later meaning into the texts of these early poets lest we should miss their true significance.

all the way from his capital and stay beyond a period in Kūḍal, and why that commonplace incident should lead to so much public talk and comment as the poet requires us to imagine. If Kūḍal were, at that time, the capital of the Pāṇḍiyans, it is unimaginable how a Pāṇḍiya king's overstaying in it should have become the talk of the whole neighbourhood. To obviate such difficulties we should simply put the most natural and appropriate construction on this particular word of a very early poet. Taking also the other attendant circumstances into consideration one may even surmise whether the name Neḍum-Celiyan, which stands to this day unexplained, is not after all the first significant title assumed by this particular Pāṇḍiyan of Korkai for the grand achievement of his life—conquering Kūḍal and extending the bounds of his kingdom to the basin of the river Vaigai. The poet does not give us the proper name of this Pāṇḍiya king. The descriptive phrase, கொற்கைப் பொருநன் வென்வேல் நெடுந் தேர்ச்செழியன், gives us the poet's characterisation of this hero, perhaps definite enough for contemporary identification.[1] He may, however, be taken as Neḍuñceliyan I, the conqueror of Kūḍal. The Pāṇḍiyans, who had till then been confined to the environs of Korkai at the mouth of the Tāmraparṇi, were by this stroke of fortune in aggressive warfare brought to Kūḍal at the basin of the Vaigai and made to play their illustrious part in a larger theatre.

The occupation of Kūḍal by Neḍuntērcceliyan *alias* Neḍuñceliyan I must naturally evoke the jealousy of the other neighbouring kings and stir up their opposition. At the beginning of his career in the new capital the southern victor was not allowed to have an easy peaceful time of it. He had to establish his claims by a further fight with two kings, whom it is not possible to make out from the incidental and altogether scrappy nature of the account of this battle of Kūḍal. Paraṇar, an early poet,

(1) Later traditions refer to one Verrivēl Celiyan and to identify him with this early victor of Kūḍal must for the present stand undecided.

refers to it as a past event. Here are his lines:

"பொய்யா விழவிற் கூடற் பறந்தலை
யுடனியைந் தெழுந்த விருபெரு வேந்தர்
கடன்மருள் பெரும்படை கலங்கத் தாக்கி
யிரங்கிசை முரச மொழியப் பரந்தவ
ரோடுபுறங் கண்ட ஞான்றை
யாடுகொள் வியன்களத் தார்ப்பினும் பெரிதே."

—*Agam.*, S. 116.

These are the only glimpses we get of the great conqueror of Kūḍal, who, if not the actual founder of the Pāṇḍiya dynasty, should at least be considered as having laid the first foundation for the sovereignty of that line of kings on an extended scale.

The Chera line: (i) Antuvan Cheral Irumporai. (ii) Udiyan Cheral (alias) Perumchorrutiyan Cheralatan.

27. Turning to the Chēras of this period we find Antuvan Chēral Irumporai is sung by poet Ṇniccēri Muḍamōsiyār and Udiyan Chēral, celebrated by Muḍināgarāyar of Murañciyūr and referred to by Iḷaṅkīranār in stanza 113 of *Naṟṟiṇai*—

"உதியன் மண்டிய வொலிதலை ஞாட்பி
னிம்மென் பெருங்களத் தியவ ரூது
மாம்பலங் குழலி னேங்கிக்
கலங்கஞ ருறுவோள் புலம்புகொ ணேக்கே."

Udiyan was a great warrior and had the reputation of having extended the boundaries of his kingdom by fresh and immense conquests. Māmūlanār, a later poet, in *Agam.*, S. 65, describes, in a pregnant epithet, the annexation policy of this conquering monarch:

"நாடுகண் ணகற்றிய வுதியஞ் சேரற்
பாடிச் சென்ற பரிசிலர் போல."

From the lines of another later poet, Kōṭṭampalattu-tuñciya-Chēramān, the Chēra king who died at Kōṭṭampalam, we get the information that he resided in Kuḻumūr, a town not yet identified. Probably Udiyanpērūr or Diamper of the Christian Synod is another town founded by the same monarch.

"பல்லான் குன்றிற் படுநிழற் சேர்ந்த
நல்லான் பரப்பிற் குழுமூ ராங்கட்
கொடைக்கட னேன்ற கோடா நெஞ்சி
னுதிய னட்டில் போல."

—*Agam.*, S. 168.

The poet here describes the sumptuous kitchen of Udiyan's palace at Kuḻumūr.[1] This king seems to have displayed such lavish hospitality in treats to his visitors and soldiers that he was dubbed by his admiring people Peruñchōṟṟu-Udiyan-Chēralātan, the Udiyan Chēralātan famous for his feasts. It is probably this fact that was caught hold of by a later panegyrist for the elaboration of a grand legend that Udiyan actually fed both the contending armies in the field of Kurukshētra throughout the entire period of the Mahābhārata War. Apart from the physical and historical impossibilities involved, surely chronology is hereby thrown to the winds. If the great war of the north took place, say somewhere about 1,000 B.C., by what conceivable legerdemain can one transport Udiyan coming near the opening centuries of the Christian Era to that far-off early period? The hiatus is too big to be bridged unless one assumes that there were two Udiyans separated by a thousand years at the lowest and that these came to be somehow confounded by an undiscerning posterity.

It is perhaps to avoid at once this preposterous conclusion and the obvious corollary that the solitary stanza standing in the name of poet Murañciyūr Muḍināgarāyar is a clear forgery, one writer suggests that the allusion to the Mahābhārata War is not to the actual war but to a scenic representation of it by a strolling theatrical troupe. The verses, however, do not seem pliant enough to bear even that charitable interpretation. They purport to record the actual fight as a contemporary event and if the stanza containing this reference should

(1) This place has been wrongly identified with Kuḻumam in the Coimbatore District.

stand as a genuine piece, we have no other alternative than to conclude that both the king and his panegyrist rubbed shoulders with the great heroes of the Mahābhārata War. However much the antiquity of Dravidian civilization may suffer, hanging for its support, in the view of some, on this solitary stanza of a late court-poet, to assert and expect us to believe that this piece is genuine is indeed too big an order on our credulity. Like 'Single Speech Hamilton' of the English Parliament of former days, Muḍināgarāyar stands as a single-stanza poet among the worthies of the 'Tamil Sangam' period. Readers may remember that he appeared in the company of divinities which graced the First Sangam with their presence. Going as he did with Agastya, Siva, Subramanya, Kubēra, he was considered as not belonging to the human kind but as Adisēṣa himself, the mythical serpent, by the late Prof. Seshagiri Sāstri. Are we to follow him in this practically useless identification or rescue Muḍināgarāyar—his name by the way sounds somewhat incongruous for that early time—to the ranks of flesh and blood humanity? In any case we shall have to leave this ancient personage to sail or sink with the Sangam vessel, elaborately rigged and floated down the times by that famous artist, the commentator of *Iṟaiyanār Agapporuḷ*. It is more than likely that when the *Puṟanānūṟu* poems were gathered into their present shape, under the patronage of probably a later Chēra sovereign, some such editorial addition, as the piece under discussion, was considered necessary to enhance the dignity and antiquity of the Chēra line as against the rival houses of Uṟaiyūr and Madura. However it be, Udiyan Chēral's historical character need scarcely be doubted. He goes into the Tables not on the strength of this interpolated verse but on the reference by Iḷaṅkīranār, corroborated also by the account in *Patiṟṟuppattu*.

The Chiefs.

28. There appears also in this generation Āayi Aṇḍiran, the great ruler of a large kingdom extending over the mountainous tracts from

the Coimbatore gap in the Western Ghats down to Cape Comorin in the south. The whole of central and south Travancore thus belonged to him and his capital seems to have been situated somewhere near the southern border of the Coimbatore District. Ptolemy, in enumerating the important inland cities between Pseudostomos, *i.e.*, the mouth of the river Periyār and the river Baris (Pālāyi) mentions a town then known as 'Adarima Koreour'. I take this as 'Adiyamān Kōḻiyūr' or 'Kōḻiyūr', the seat of Adiyan or Adiyamān, a contracted form of Adiyarmagan. We have already found one Adiyan in southern Coimbatore coming into conflict with Nannan, the northern king. I think that Adiyan belonged to the Āayi tribe or a branch of it and held his court at Kōḻiyūr, not yet identified.[1] Āayi Aṇḍiran was a powerful sovereign of the Āyar or shepherd tribe and his dominion ran north and south right through the middle of the southern corner of the Peninsula and divided the Tamil kingdoms of the Chōḻas and the Pāṇḍiyas in the east from the territory of the Chēras in the west. He patronised the Tamil poets most liberally and three poets, Muḍamōsiyār of Eṇiccēri, Uṟaiyūr (in *Puṟam.*, S. 374), Kuṭṭuvan Kīranār (in *Puṟam.*, S. 240) and Ōḍaikiḻār of Tuṟaiyūr (in *Puṟam.*, S. 136) have sung his praises as contemporaries. Another poet Kārikkaṇṇanār also refers to him in *Naṟṟiṇai*, S. 237. Of these, Muḍamōsiyār, who has sung about the Chōḻa king Muḍittalai-Kō-Perunaṟkiḷḷi and the Chēra sovereign Antuvan Chēral, serves as the lateral link to establish the contemporaneity of Āayi Aṇḍiran with the rulers mentioned above. It must be noted that Aṇḍiran was an independent sovereign himself like any one of the three Tamil kings of that period and that the later literary tradition which assigned him a place only amongst the chiefs was due entirely to a misreading of the facts of early Tamil History as the sequel will show.

(1) Kuṟuṅkōḻiyūr, a town mentioned in the 'Sangam' works may probably be this city. It may have been so called to distinguish it from Peruṅkōḻyūr, another name for Uṟaiyūr, the capital of the Chōḻas.

Before passing on to the fourth generation I have to observe that the detailed information about the three generations we have already dealt with have been gathered mostly from the references by later poets. In this I have generally refrained from bringing in the references by such poets as come after Karikāl the Great. This, I trust, has saved the Tables from the inclusion of any dubious material. I have largely drawn on one of the Pre-Karikāl poets, Paraṇar, and utilized his information for the construction of the earliest genealogies in each line. Though this must have contributed to some extent to the accuracy of the data handled, I am aware that absolute certainty which can proceed only from contemporary references can hardly be claimed for the first three generations. Still as far as the Chōḻa line is concerned, I have not the least apprehension that future researches would in any manner unsettle the order of succession herein indicated. But that however is not the case with the first names that appear in the Pāṇḍiya and the Chēra dynasties of sovereigns. They might be shifted, if at all, a generation or two earlier. The Pāṇḍiya king of Koṟkai, whom I have taken as Neḍuñceḻiyan I, is placed in the third generation on the strength of the reference by poet Pērālavāyār, who belongs to the fourth. It is quite likely that Pērālavāyār may have been a contemporary of Neḍuñceḻiyan I and his immediate successor. Still if the poet's reference to the conqueror of Kūḍal were taken as bearing upon a past event, there is no reason why that sovereign should be made the immediate predecessor of the second Pāṇḍiya king in the line. The conquest of Kūḍal might be supposed to have been effected a few generations earlier. Both Kapilar and Paraṇar, who allude to Akutai, the previous occupant of Kūḍal, being later poets do not help us in definitely fixing Akutai's or Koṟkai Pāṇḍiyan's time; nor does Veḷḷerukkilaiyār who sings of Evvi I, Akutai's opponent, in any way serve our purpose, for that poetess stands isolated, with absolutely no connection with

any of the other personages in the Tables. In these circumstances I had to bring in other considerations to settle the place of the first Pāṇḍiya king. From the Tables one will see that the third, the fifth and the seventh Pāṇḍiyans go under the same name, Neḍuñceḻiyan. There would be some appropriateness then I thought of the first place going to a Neḍuñceḻiyan, the individual whose achievement alone has given rise to that distinctive Pāṇḍiya name. Neḍuñceḻiyan II, the third in the Pāṇḍiya line, otherwise known as Pasumpūn-Pāṇḍiyan fought with Evvi II, while Koṛkai Pāṇḍiyan's opponent Akutai seems to have killed Evvi I, probably the grandfather of the previous Evvi. Facts such as these, though not of much decisiveness in themselves, have weighed with me in giving the conqueror of Kūḍal his present place in the Tables. This arrangement further brings him closer to poet Pērālavāyār, and no useful purpose would be served by shifting the incident referred to by that poet to a remoter antiquity than is justifiable by attendant circumstances. The place of the second Pāṇḍiya king, Pūtappāṇḍiyan, the conqueror of Ollaiyūr, being definitely fixed, the shifting of the conqueror of Kūḍal to a higher antiquity only tends to create a gap between himself and the second Pāṇḍiyan in the line, a gap which certainly cannot be filled in by any of the Pāṇḍiyans known to us from literature. Thus, instead of leaving the first Pāṇḍiyan, the conqueror of Kūḍal, disconnected with the Tables, I have taken the only legitimate course open to me of placing him as the immediate predecessor of Pūtappāṇḍiyan. Furthermore, there occur events in the next generation which add to the reasonableness of this arrangement. Still for purposes of scientific certainty, which I confess has not been attained in this instance, I may leave the question open for future research to decide, though the chances of any variation, I should think, appear to be very little.

In the Chēra line, however, the first sovereign the conqueror of Karuvūr is no better than a hypothetical

insertion. The poet Nariveruttalaiyār who celebrates him does not tune his lyre to sing of any other sovereign in the Tables. He too stands isolated, and hence his king and himself might brook a shifting. I have, however, already explained the reasons which have led me to assign him his present place in the Tables. Here too I cannot but leave the question open and shall be the last to claim any absolute accuracy for the disposition I have made. It is only on account of the extreme paucity of literary evidence that I have been thus compelled to leave this matter in some uncertainty. Still in constructing a system of Tables which must stand criticism and be absolutely reliable I cannot hide from myself, still less from my readers, the fact that complete certitude has not been attained as regards the position of the first Chēra sovereign in the line. It is quite possible that further research may throw some light into a region where we have now to grope our way with uncertain steps. To mark, however, this want of scientific certainty, I have adopted the expedient of enclosing this king's name in the Tables in square brackets and expect my readers to take it with the reservation herein indicated. As for the seven generations that follow the very fact that they have been arranged on testimony wholly contemporary should invest them with as much exactitude and certainty as are possible in the valuation and use of literary materials. From the great care bestowed on their arrangement I feel convinced that the Tables are reliable and will stand the test of any fair criticism. In our progress through them we can plant our steps securely on solid ground and feel that we are not in a dark and uncertain region.

The link-names.

29. The linear links connecting the third generation with the fourth are supplied by two poets, Kaḻāttalaiyār and Muḍamōsiyār of Eṇiccēri. Kaḻāttalaiyār, as a contemporary, sings of the next Chōḻa sovereign in the line, Vēlpah-taḍakkai-

Peruviral-Kiḷḷi, Kiḷḷi, the great hero with many javelins in his hands. Muḍamōsiyār seems connected with Mōsikīranar, a poet who sings of Āayi in the generation after the next. The latter poet was in all probability the son of Muḍamōsiyār with his father's name prefixed to his. Some are inclined to construe Mōsikīranār as Kīranār of Mōsi, a town.[1] I am not at all disposed to take that view of the matter. Then, as now, the practice in the Tamil land seems to have been to prefix the father's name to the son's. Thus Mōsi Kīranār should be taken as Kīranār, the son of Mōsi. Until other evidences of a more compelling nature turn up, this I think is the only feasible method of interpretation. Both Muḍamōsiyār and Mōsi Kīranār appear a generation apart and this fact naturally suggests the relationship stated above. Even if our readers are still disposed to consider this suggested link unsatisfactory, the secure link of Kaḷāttalaiyār should commend itself as unimpeachable. The poet Pēralavāyār, who refers to the conquest of Kūḍal, appears as a contemporary poet of Pūtappāṇḍiyan, the second in the Pāṇḍiya line of kings. This fact too provides an additional means of connection. As regards the Chēra genealogy the account of relationship given by the redactor of *Patiṟṟuppattu* has been followed and I see no

(1) The editor of *Agaṉāṉūṟu* converts Mōsikīranār into Mōsikkaraiyanār and assigns the poet to a town Mōsikkarai. The editor of *Naṟṟiṇai,* while admitting Mōsikīran as Kīran of Mōsi, a town, furnishes another bit of information that the poet is in other places called Paḍumāṟṟūr Mōsikīran—a circumstance which hardly bears out the view of construing Mōsi, as a town name. In his notes on another poet Mōsi Kaṇṇattanār the latter editor mentions Mōsippaṭṭi in Tiruppūvaṇam Taluq and Mōsukuḍi in Paramakuḍi Taluq as helping the identification of the poet's village. It is clear that, in their efforts to clear up the mystery of a personal name, these editors have only added to the uncertainty on hand the uncertainties attendant on the identification of a place! Pinattūr Nārāyanaswāmi Aiyar, the editor of *Naṟṟiṇai,* forgetting for the nonce that Muḍamōsiyār had a definite village and district assigned to him,—for that poet is reported to have belonged to Ēṇiccēri, in the District Uṟaiyūr—tries to transport him to any one of the highly doubtful modern villages Mōsippaṭṭi or Mōsukkuḍi. Such identification of places offhand on the strength of mere similarity in sound, which is generally in vogue, cannot be too strongly deprecated. The ancient geography of Tamiḻagam should form a separate study by itself to yield any positive results.

reason to deviate from it. The details as can be gathered from that work tally beautifully with the facts otherwise brought on the Tables. This will be made clear as we proceed further.

THE FOURTH GENERATION.

VEL-PAH-TADAKKAI-PERUVIRAL-KILLI PERIOD.

The Chola line: Vel-pah-tadakkai Peruviral-Killi.

30. The relationship between Mudittalai-Kō-Perunarkilli and Vēl-pah-tadakkai-Peruviral-Killi is nowhere even hinted at; still it may be presumed that the latter was the son of the former. Vēl-pah-tadakkai-Peruviral-Killi, who may be supposed to have succeeded his father on the Uraiyūr throne had to meet with an early death. Himself and one Chēra king Neduñchēralātan, presumably Imaiyavaramban[1] Neduñchēralātan of later day nomenclature, met in a field of battle and in the fierce conflict that ensued both of them

(1) It would be interesting to trace the history of this name 'Imaiyavaramban', which does not find a place in any of the four primary works we are handling, nor even in the body of the secondary work *Palirruppattu.* In the portion of the latter work devoted to this king, known as the "Second Ten" he is invariably referred to as "Neduñchēralātan' or 'Chēralātan'. However, in the first verse, the poet in eulogizing the king's victory over the 'Kadamba' tribes introduces a simile that the foes encountered by him were considered the front-rank heroes among the rulers of countries extending from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin. This is a mere poetic hyperbole to heighten the heroism of Neduñchēralātan and depict him as having won his victory even against such terrible odds. The verse runs:

"கவிர்ததை சிலம்பிற் றுஞ்சுங் கவரி
பரந்திலங் கருவியொடு நரந்தங் கனவு
மாரியர் துவன்றிய பேரிசை யிமயந்
தென்னங் குமரி யொடாயிடை
மன்மீக் கூறுநர் மறந்தபக் கடந்தே"

The *Patigam* or colophon later on added to this piece, however, stretches the poetic figure to supply biographical matter and attaches the epithet Imaiyavaramban to Neduñchēralātan. This seems to have been taken up still later by the author of *Chilappadikāram* and expanded with numerous details of imaginary victories over the Aryan kings in North India—a description which no historian conversant with the conditions of India at that time would even entertain as a serious hypothesis.

had to lay down their lives. We do not know with whom remained the fortunes of the day in this bloody duel. The unhappy close of the conflict ending in the death of both the combatants was a sufficiently pathetic incident which could not but evoke the mournful numbers of two contemporary poets, Kaḻāttalaiyār and Paraṇar. Both bemoan this sad event in poems of singular beauty and pathos which directly touch our heart-strings. To have a taste of the power and beauty of the Tamil elegiac muse the reader should only attune his mind to the sombre necessities of that fateful moment and himself spend a few minutes over stanzas 62 and 63 in the *Puṟanāṉūṟu* collection. The unknown collector of *Puṟanāṉūṟu* informs us by an appended note that the scene of this memorable battle was Pōr, a place somewhere near the upper reaches of the Kāviri and on the borders of the Trichinopoly District. If so, we have to assume that the Chēras had already begun to advance into the Koṅgu country and carry out their policy of conquest.[1] The Chōḻas too seem to have had the same objective in view. Naturally enough two such powers swooping down on a common prey could not but come to grips sooner or later and that happened in the battle of Pōr, which ended so disastrously to both.

The Pandiya line: Putappandiyan.

31. The second Pāṇḍiyan, who comes in the Tables is Pūtappāṇḍiyan. He is also known as Ollaiyūr-tanta-Pūtappāṇḍiyan, *i.e.*, Pūtappāṇḍiyan who conquered and annexed Ollaiyūr to his kingdom. Poet Pērālavāyār, who alludes to the annexation of Kūḍal by the preceding Pāṇḍiya king, appears to have been a contemporary of Pūtappāṇḍiyan, for his poem, composed on the occasion of that monarch's queen ascending the funeral pyre of

(1) The first Chēra king who entered the Koṅgu country must be Udiyan Chēral, the king who is described as நாடு கண்ணகற்றிய உதியஞ் சேரல், the Chēra king who expanded the Chēra dominions. Peruñchēralātan, who fell in the battle of Veṇṇi fought with Karikāl I, was, as suggested previously, Udiyan Chēral himself, who should thus be supposed to have come into the Koṅgu country, to render that engagement possible.

her husband, enables us to definitely fix his time. Two facts are worthy of notice in respect of this king, first his position as the ruler of Kūḍal was not that of a sovereign of a very extensive dominion round about that capital, and secondly that he occupied a rank much inferior to that of Titiyan, the Aayi king of Pothiyil and his own contemporary. Pūtappāṇḍiyan was himself a poet and the testimony for the afore-mentioned facts can very easily be drawn from one of his verses. Only the reader is expected to free his mind of any prepossessions due to the later traditions about the extent and importance of the Madura Power and rightly appraise the direct testimony proceeding from the mouth of one of the earliest Pāṇḍiya kings. In stanza 71 of *Puṟanāṉūṟu* the royal poet conveys his determination to overcome his enemy kings and expresses the strength of his resolution in an oath, as was quite usual with the old-time warriors:

மடங்கலிற் சினைஇ மடங்கா வுள்ளத்
தடங்காத் தானை வேந்த ருடங்கியைந்
தென்னொடு பொருது மென்ப வவரை
யாரம ரலறத் தாக்கித் தேரோ
டவர்ப்புறங் காணே னாயிற் சிறந்த
பேரம ருண்க ணிவளினும் பிரிக
வறனிலை திரியா வன்பி னவையத்துத்
திறனி லொருவனை நாட்டி முறைதிரிந்து
மெலிகோல் செய்தே னாகுக மலிபுகழ்
வையை சூழ்ந்த வளங்கெழு வைப்பிற்
பொய்யா யாணர் மையற் கோமான்
மாவனு மன்னெயி லாந்தையு முரைசா
லந்துவஞ் சாத்தனு மாத னழிசியும்
வெஞ்சின வியக்கனு முளப்படப் பிறரும்
கண்போ னண்பிற் கேளிரொடு கலந்த
வின்களி மகிழ்நகை யிழுக்கியா னொன்றோ
மன்பதை காக்கு நீள்குடிச் சிறந்த
தென்புலங் காவலி னொரீஇப் பிறர்
வன்புலங் காவலின் மாறியான் பிறக்கே.

—*Puṟam.*, S. 71.

In this stanza what interests us more than the many evils which the furious monarch calls down on himself in the event of his not fighting his enemies to the finish and overcoming them is the manner in which he refers to a number of rulers, all perhaps not above the rank of a chieftain, as his friends and compeers. It is clear that at least some of these companions of Pūtappāṇḍiyan were then independent chiefs ruling over different states near the basin of the river Vaigai. If these had been merely his tributary chiefs, his reference to them would have been pitched in a different key. The existence of a number of small independent states scattered about Kūḍal does in no way justify the assumption of an extensive Kūḍal kingdom covering the entire Vaigai basin at that early time. Though the Pāṇḍiya king Neḍuntēr-Ceḻiyan of Koṟkai might be supposed to have become the master of a fairly extensive state in the vicinity of Kūḍal, he should not be considered as having conquered the whole country on either bank of the river Vaigai. He conquered the Kūḍal principality and left it for a branch of his family as a nucleus for further expansion. His successor had still to meet the implacable enmity of the other kings and face them in battle to keep possession of the new acquisition. Pūtappāṇḍiyan had to make common cause with a number of neighbouring chieftains, till he felt himself secure from the attacks of such enemy kings. Such facts as these should give us an idea of the modest dimensions of the Kūḍal kingdom annexed to Koṟkai. In another poem of his (*Agam.*, S. 25) appear the following significant lines:

> "வருவர் வாழி தோழி பொருநர்
> செல்சமங் கடந்த வில்கெழு தடக்கைப்
> பொதியிற் செல்வன் பொலந்தேர்த் திதிய
> னின்னிசை யியத்திற் கறங்குங்
> கன்மிசை யருவிய காடிறந் தோரே"

In these lines the royal poet expresses his great respect towards Titiyan, the Aayi king of Pothiyil and

conveys also in a way his estimate of the latter's status as the ruler of an extensive mountain-dominion. A lady-love bewailing the separation of a lover is generally made by the Tamil poets—and it seems almost a convention with most of them—to describe the lover as having gone beyond the farthest corner of the Tamil land known to her. Titiyan's dominions being taken here as the utmost stretch beyond which the heroine could not transport her lover, even in her imagination, it is but reasonable to conclude that the Pothiyil dominions then served as the *ultima thule* for marking the distant wanderings of the absent lover. The extensiveness of the Pothiyil kingdom need not, however, be based upon this literary argument alone, which may not be convincing to the general reader, not familiar with the conventions of the Tamil poets. The significant descriptive phrase 'Pothiyilcelvan' (பொதியிற் செல்வன்), the prosperous lord of Pothiyil—I confess the translation does not convey half the expressive strength of the original—proceeding from a royal poet of Pūtappāṇḍiyan's standing and pedigree is the strongest and the most unexceptionable evidence to establish the higher status and consequently the larger dominion of the Āayi king Titiyan of that period. I am all the more inclined to emphasise this aspect, because distance of time and intervening historical accidents have now prevented posterity from appreciating the greatness and independence of the Āayi kings of those early days. In the works of later commentators and scholars the Āayi kings have not only been described as the rulers of a petty hill-state but have been degraded to the position of mere chiefs and dependents on any one of the Tamil triumvirates. At any rate, this specific reference of Ollaiyūr-tanta-Pūtappāṇḍiyan is not at all consistent with such a view. It establishes in the clearest manner the independence of the Āayi kings of the south and a greater testimony than this, proceeding as it does from the mouth of a rival sovereign, few will be inclined to demand. Still to clinch this infer-

ence I draw the reader's attention to the following words of a contemporary poet Muḍamōsiyār of Ēṇiccēri in *Puṟam.*, S. 128.

> " கழறொடி யாஅய் மழைதவழ் பொதியி
> லாடுமகள் குறுகி னல்லது
> பீடுகெழு மன்னர் குறுகலோ வரிதே."

If the Āayi king had been merely a petty chieftain dependent on any one of the Tamil kings of that time, surely the poet would not have sung in this strain. These lines then should suffice to place the independence of the Āayi kings beyond any reasonable doubt.

(1) Celva-Kadunko-Ali Atan (alias) Chikkarpalli - tunciya-celva - Kadunko, (alias) Mantaran-Poraiyan-Kadunko.
(2) Kudakko-Neduncheralatan.
(3) Palyanai-Cel-Kelu-Kuttuvan

32. The Chēra line had three sovereigns for this period. Of these Celva-Kaduṅkō was not so famous for his war-like qualities as for the gentler virtues which made him a great patron of the poets. He was noted for unstinted munificence and reported to have made a present of the town Ōkandūr, not yet identified, to some unknown person. Paranar, who sings of him, sings also of Neḍuñchēralātan. Neḍuñchēralātan, the so-called Imaiyavaramban, and his brother Palyānai-Cel-Keḻu-Kuṭṭuvan,[1] Kuṭṭuvan, 'the possessor of battalions of elephants' were great warriors. The former had extended the Chēra dominions to the confines of the Ayiri mountain, north of the southern

(1) The meaning of the phrase யானைச்செல் in the apparently significant title of the Chēra king cannot be clearly made out. The later meanings of cloud, thunder and sky given in the *Tamil Lexicon* and the *Sangam Dictionary* are obviously inapplicable here. However from the following lines of stanza 323 of *Aganānūṟu*.

> பலவுப்பல தடைஇய வேய்பயி லடுக்கத்
> தியானைச் செல்லினங் கடுப்ப வானத்து
> கால்வீழ்த் தன்றுநின் கதுப்புறழ் புயலே,

we may infer that செல் means a drove or row of elephants. Referring to a moving column of the animals it may be connected with the verbal root செல், to go. It is also highly probable that the words செல்வு and செல்வம் which at present mean wealth generally must be traced to this possession of elephants as furnishing a concrete standard of wealth in ancient times.

border of Tuḷunāḍu and seems to have fought some battles with the Aryan kings beyond that limit. The redactor of *Patiṟṟuppattu* gives a graphic account of how Neduñchēralātan punished some Yavanas or Greeks by pinioning their arms behind their backs and pouring ghee over their heads as a mark of disgrace. What those Yavanas were guilty of to deserve this humiliation we are not informed of. The account, however, is too circumstantial to be dismissed as a concoction. Assuming it as a historical fact it strengthens the hypothesis of a Greek colony[1] in the West Coast at that time. The *Periplus of the Erythræan Sea* mentions a place called Byzantium to the north of Tyndis, Naura, and the White Islands in the West Coast of the Peninsula. It may have been the Greek colony, some of whose citizens were thus openly disgraced according to *Patiṟṟuppattu*. Probably owing to the chastisement administered by Neḍuñchēralātan, the colony must have declined and by the time of Ptolemy disappeared altogether, for the latter has absolutely nothing to say regarding it. This conqueror, as we have already pointed out, had to meet with his equal in the Chōḻa monarch Vēl-pah-taḍakkai-Peruviṟaṟkiḷḷi and also his end in the field of battle. His brother Palyānai-Cel-Keḻu-Kuṭṭuvan, first appears to have conquered Umpaṟkāḍu (literally the Elephant Forest) and gained a permanent footing in the Koṅgu country. Although we have no means of definitely identifying this territory, we may take it as the borderland of the Coimbatore District adjoining the present Ānaimalai Hills. Probably by this conquest of the Elephant tracts he may have secured the honorific addition to the general name 'Kuṭṭuvan' to distinguish him from the other Kuṭṭuva rulers of that time. I

(1) Prof. Dubreuil wants to make out that the Temple of Augustus was a temple dedicated to Agastya! What a dislocation of South Indian Chronology! Compare in this connection the following finding of A. C. Haddon: "Pahlava or Parthians of Persia, and Yavana or Asiatic Greeks settled in Western India about this time (middle of second century, B.C.) *Wanderings of Peoples*, p. 28.

have my own doubts whether this qualifying adjunct 'Palyānai-cel-keḻu' did not supply the cue for the coinage of a later myth that that sovereign brought the waters of the eastern and western seas in one day to his capital by means of his elephants posted in a continuous line from the Arabian Sea to the Bay of Bengal. Poetic exaggeration notwithstanding, there need scarcely be any doubt that by the conquest of the 'Elephant country' or forest, this king was in a position to bring into the field more of these ponderous pachyderms than any of his rival kings. Poet Pālai Kautamanār, who eulogizes this king in *Patiṟ-ṟuppattu,* gives him credit for having subjugated the whole of Koṅgunāḍu. From poet Ammūvanār's verse (*Naṟṟiṇai,* S. 395) we learn that Māndai, a town in the West Coast, was then in the possession of the Chēra kings. Whether Mandagara of the *Periplus* in the Pirate Coast in South Konkan could be identified with this town should be looked into.

The Chieftains.

33. Āayi Titiyan I, the king of Pothiyil, should be considered as the successor of Āayi Aṇḍiran of the previous generation. Strictly speaking his true place is not among the chiefs but amongst the other sovereigns of that period. Since, however, his dynasty comes to a close a generation hence, he has not been given a more prominent place in the Tables. In *Agam.,* S. 322, poet Paraṇar refers to this ruler and his Pothiyil kingdom. A number of chiefs, such as Añci of the Kudirai Hill, Pāri of the Parambu Hill, Ōri of the Kolli Mount, and Kāri of Muḷḷūr appear in this generation. All these forest chiefs should be located near the northern borders of the Koṅgu country which included in its extent the southern corner of Mysore and a part of the Salem District. Of these, Pāri and Ōri seem to have been defeated and killed in this generation. And by the next, sundry other forest powers go out of existence. It was by the vigour, military skill, the land-grabbing tendency and ambition of the Chēra sovereigns, that the northern boundary

of their dominions was pushed still further north to the basin of the Pālār river.

Link-names. Poets Paranar and Kapilar form the linear links connecting this generation with the next.

THE FIFTH GENERATION.

URUVA-PAH-TER-ILANCEDCENNI PERIOD.

The Chola line: Uruva-pah-ter- Ilancedcenni.

34. After the death of Vēl-pah-taḍakkai-Peruviral-killi, the throne of Uraiyūr had to pass through a crisis. That sanguinary engagement at Pōr in which Vēl-pah-taḍakkai-Peruviral-killi lost his life must have considerably shaken the military power and prestige of the Killi family. There should have been none in that line to succeed the ill-fated sovereign immediately and bear the burdens of an expanding monarchy. Uruva-pah-tēr-Ilañcēḍcenni, *alias* Neytalankānal Ilañcēḍcenni, *alias* Cheruppāḷi-Yerinta-Ilañcēḍcenni, being a scion of the northern branch, was then in charge of the coast country of the Chōḻas. I have already suggested that he should be considered as the son of Karikāl I *alias* Perumpūncenni. He was a great warrior and had already won his spurs in the battle of Ceruppāḷi. He had an army behind him to back up his claims. He seems to have ascended the Chōḻa throne at Uraiyūr and by that act paved the way in times to come for much bitterness of feeling and animosity and sometimes even open conflict between the Killi and the Cenni branches of that family. Though Ilañcēḍcenni, by his superior might and generalship, kept down the forces of disorder, in his lifetime, these appear to have flamed out into open violence at the time of his death and effectively stayed the chances of his son Karikālan II quietly succeeding him on the Uraiyūr throne. This will be noticed later on.

This sovereign appears in literature under many different names and considerations of order, simplicity and consistency demand that they should be taken as refer-

ring to one and the same individual and no more. During the time of Karikālan I, the great Cenni, his son should naurally be expected to be known as Iḷañcēḍcenni, the young Cenni, who as heir-apparent was ruling a distant province. I have interpreted the word 'சேண்' in the same Cēdcenni in the light of the political circumstances obtaining at the time; but the term may mean also 'noble.'[1] He was also called Neytalaṅkānal Iḷañcēḍcenni, because he was in charge of that maritime district, noted by Ptolemy as 'Paralia of the Soretai'. His conquest of a northern hill fort and his victory over a forest chieftain presumably gained for him the additional title Cerup-paāḻi-Yeṟinta-Iḷañcēḍcenni. He should have been a seasoned warrior and pretty well-advanced in years when he succeeded the ill-starred Kiḷḷi of Uraiyūr. For an account of this sovereign's character and acts readers are referred to the poems of the contemporary poets noted in the Tables.

The Pandiya line: Pasumpun-Pandiyan (alias) Nilamtaru-tiruvil-Pandiyan, (alias) Pannadu-tanta-Pandiyan (alias) Vadimbalam-baninra-Pandiyan.

35. In this generation appears one of the greatest warriors of the Pāṇḍiya line. It is no doubt by a strange irony of circumstance that his name, like that of his still greater predecessor and founder of the Kūḍal line, should happen to be buried so deep in the stray references of the texts as to escape the notice of the casual reader. By a still stranger irony the 'common herd' of the later Pāṇḍiya kings have thrown into the shade the earlier heroes —the real builders of the Pāṇḍiya greatness—and have secured from posterity a larger share of its attention. We have to console ourselves with the reflection that time has swallowed up and swallows still many greater names than these. The Pāṇḍiyan of Koṟkai, Neḍuñceḻiyan I,

(1) Poet Kapilar uses சேடு, a variant of this word, in the line "தார ணியானைச்சேட்டிருங்கோவே" (*Puram.*, S. 201), in the sense 'noble'. The ideas, *high*, *noble*, etc., must have evolved subsequently from the initial physical conception of distance.

and Pasumpūṇ Pāṇḍiyan or Neduñceḻiyan II have, to all intents and purposes, become mere shadowy figures and have almost lost their place amongst the historical Pāṇḍiyans of this famous line. Still patient research in the archives of ancient literary remains has enabled us to exhume and resuscitate these heroes of antiquity from their undeserved oblivion and bring them once more before the foot-lights of the Pāṇḍiya history. The name of this great conqueror, Pasumpūṇ Pāṇḍiyan, is as usual merely a descriptive one. It imports 'Pāṇḍiyan, the be-jewelled'. Although this was a common enough epithet in the mouths of all the Tamil poets of that time, I find that in the usage of the earliest of that early band of poets the name seems to have been invariably used to denote this particular Pāṇḍiyan of that line and none other. Invariable usage has converted this general name into a proper one and I believe we have no right at this distance of time to try to translate that name and make it generic. This particular Pāṇḍiyan has been ignored by posterity not only by what appeared to them a generic title but by a medley of other names under which he appears in literature. By his victory over the Āayi king and the Koṅgu people and the consequent annexation of their territories to his dominion, he was known as Pannāḍu-tanta-Pāṇḍiyan (பன்னாடு தந்த பாண்டியன்) or the Pāṇḍiyan who conquered and annexed many *nāḍus* (*Agam.*, S. 253). This name was later on converted into what they considered a more dignified form Nilam-taru-Tiruvil-Pāṇḍiyan, a name, which, with all its different phraseology, conveys the same meaning as the previous one (*Agam.*, S. 338 and *Puram.*, S. 76). Since by these victories of his the Pāṇḍiya dominion till then confined to the coast of the Eastern Sea was extended to the very rim of the Arabian Sea in the West, he came to be justly known as Vaḍimbu-alamba-Ninṟa-Pāṇḍiyan or the Pāṇḍiyan who so extended his kingdom as to be literally washed by the two seas. To celebrate this stroke of rare good fortune he is said to have celebrated a sea-festival

on a grand scale (vide *Puram.*, S. 9). Naturally enough these different names scattered throughout later literature presented a puzzle to still later generations who were thus prevented from ascribing the various names to one historical character. The tangle thus created is however straightened by a careful collation and comparison of the texts of the most ancient poets. From them all one historical figure stands out clearly and rivets our attention. In all probability Pasumpūṇ Pāṇḍiyan may have been the grandson of the conqueror of Kūḍal and the son of Ollaiyūr-tanta-Pūta-Pāṇḍiyan, his predecessor.[1]

Immediately after his succession to the throne, he turned his attention to the north of Kūḍal and found Evvi II blocking his expansion in that direction. Evidently Akutai's victory over Evvi I, presumably the grandfather of Evvi II, did not lead to any annexation of Evvi's territory to the Kūḍal kingdom. The lines of Paraṇar:

யாழிசை மறுகி னீடூர் கிழவோன்
வாய்வா ளெவ்வி யேவன் மேவார்
நெடுமிடல் சாய்த்த பசும்பூட் பொருந்தில
ரரிமணை வாயி லுறத்தூ ராங்கண்

—*Agam.*, S. 266.

convey that Evvi II was defeated by Pasumpūṇ Pāṇḍiyan and probably also brought under subjection. Then the king turned his attention to the great western kingdom,

(1) I assume this relationship by the following topographical facts. Immediately after his conquest of the Āayi or Pothiyil dominion Pasumpūṇ Pāṇḍiyan appears to have renamed one ancient city of that kingdom, now situated in the Tōvaḷai Taluq of the Travancore State and just near the foot of the Ghats as Aḻagiapāṇḍiyanūr or Aḻagiapāṇḍiyapuram. In ancient documents I understand that the name of this town appears as அதியனூ ரென்ற அழகியபாண்டியபுரம். Atiyan was the Āayi king at that time, who had been conquered by this Pāṇḍiyan, and I find the recitation of the name in the documents true and appropriate enough. The names Pasumpūṇ Pāṇḍiyan and Aḻagiapāṇḍiyan almost mean the same thing. What strikes me as peculiarly significant is the existence of another town with a rock-cut temple, just three or four miles to the south, Pūtappāṇḍi by name, the head-quarters of the taluq. Probably after the conquest Pasumpūṇ Pāṇḍiyan founded this town in memory of his father Pūta-Pāṇḍiyan. These facts predispose me to assume Ollaiyūr-tanta-Pūta-Pāṇḍiyan as the father of the great conqueror of Pothiyil.

the Aayi territory of Pothiyil. He made no delay in invading and permanently occupying it. Paraṇar describes graphically how the victorious flags borne on the backs of the elephant-troops of the Pāṇḍiya king waved over the Pothiyil hills. Here are the lines:—

"நசைபிழைப் பறியாக் கழறொடி யதிகன்
கோளற வறியாப் பயங்கெழு பலவின்
வேங்கை சேர்ந்த வெற்பகம் பொலிய
வில்கெழு தானைப் பசும்பூட் பாண்டியன்
களிறணி வெல்கொடி கடுப்பக் காண்வர."

—*Agam.*, S. 162.

No doubt the description appears incidentally in the stanza; but I have little doubt that it refers to the downfall of the Aayi house in the south Atiyan thereafter became a tributary chief of the Kūḍal king and had to take command of his forces against the Koṅgu people. Since before this memorable victory the Aayi kingdom extended up to the southern borders of Coimbatore, it effectively blocked the way of the king of Kūḍal in gaining access to the Koṅgu land. But Pasumpūṇ Pāṇḍiyan's success against the Pothiyil king opened a ready means of approach to the coveted region and no sooner was Pothiyil occupied than we find him carrying the war into the heart of the Koṅgu country. Stanza 393 in *Kuṟuntogai* by poet Paraṇar has reference to this war:

"மயங்குமலர்க் கோதை குழைய மகிழ்நன்
மயங்கிய நாடவச் சிலவே யலரே
கூடைக் கோழி வாகைப் பறந்தலைப்
பசும்பூட் பாண்டியன் வினைவ லதிகன்
களிறொடு பட்ட ஞான்றை
யொளிறுவாட் கொங்க ரார்ப்பினும் பெரிதே."

Though Aayi Atiyan fell in this battle, the Koṅgu war must have been prosecuted with considerable vigour and brought in some fresh addition of territory to the Kūḍal kingdom. The verses of Nakkīrar, a later poet though, may be taken as decisive on that point. He says:

"வாடாப் பூவிற் கொங்கரோட்டி
நாடுபல தந்த பசும்பூட் பாண்டியன்."

—*Agam.*, S. 253.

By a vigorous policy of expansion Pasumpūṇ Pāṇḍiyan brought the limited kingdom of Kūḍal—for we know how modest its extent was at the time of Ollaiyūr-tanta-Pūta-Pāṇḍiyan—to embrace the whole of the central and south Travancore. Naturally enough this expansion of the Pāṇḍiya kingdom from the eastern sea to the western should come to be looked upon as the finest feat of arms by the later Pāṇḍiyans and its protagonist was since given by them the honoured surname 'Nilam-taru-tiruvil Neḍiyōn', *i.e.*, the king Neḍuñceḻiyan who conquered and annexed many territories to the Pāṇḍiya kingdom.

The Chera line: (1) Kuttuvan Irumporai, (alias) Perumcheral Irumporai, (alias) Takadur-Yerinta-PerunCheral-Irumporai. (2) Kalankaykkanni Narmudi-Cheral. (3) Kadal-Pirakkottiya Vel-Kelu-Kuttuvan.

36. Three Chēra sovereigns appear in this generation. Of these, Kuṭṭuvan Irumpoṟai, ruling at Karuvūr, extended the Chēra kingdom by the conquest of north Koṅgu. While Pasumpūṇ Pāṇḍiyan swept away Atiyan of the south, this Chēra king led his army north and conquered Takadūr, the seat of another branch of the same Āayi family. Two poets, Mōsi Kīranār and Arisil Kiḻār, have sung about this victory of Takadūr. The other two Chēra kings, the sons of Neḍuñchēralātan, must have been ruling over the coastal region extending north from Kuṭṭanāḍu. Kaḷaṅkāykkaṇṇi Nārmuḍi-Chēral had to re-conquer Pūḻināḍu from Nannan II and thus gave that northern power its final quietus. Vēl-Keḻu-Kuṭṭuvan had also to complete the work of his father in fighting the Kadamba tribes, who had been giving much trouble by their piracies. Poet Paraṇar has composed the "Fifth Ten" in *Patiṟṟuppattu* to celebrate the victories of this hero. There is absolutely nothing in Paraṇar's account of this king which could justify the identification of this character with Ceṅkuṭṭuvan Chēra, the hero of *Cilappadikāram*,

a work of later days. To the achievements of this king narrated by the poet, the editor of *Patirruppattu* adds a few more in his poetic summary called 'Patigam'. The siege of Idumbil and the conquest of Viyalūr and Kodukūr may be allowed as actual occurrences in the life-time of a war-like king.[1] But along with this enumeration is introduced the historically impossible feat of the king's incursions into North India, all for fetching a piece of stone from the Himalayas for the effigy of the "Chaste Wife" deified. This entry is flagrantly apocryphal;[2] and the problem presented for solution is not to find out the grain of historical truth it may contain but to determine its relation to the *Cilappadikāram* story. Did this supply the suggestion for the later account in *Cilappadikāram* or was it inserted in *Patirruppattu* after the composition of that epic to add some authenticity to its narration? The question cannot be confidently answered either was just now. In any case, the sooner we give up the practice of appealing to the highly imaginative poems, *Cilappadikāram* and *Maṇimēkalai* for facts of ancient Tamil history, the better it is for sound research.

The Chieftains.

37. Among the chiefs, Evvi II and Āayi Atiyan have already been mentioned in connection with Pasumpūṇ Pāṇḍiyan. They call for no further remarks here. Eḻini, who belonged to the Atiyar family, a branch of the Āayi kings of the south,

(1) The 'Patigam' in *Patirruppattu* is responsible for these details.

(2) It does not find a place in Vēl-Keḻu-Kuṭṭuvan's biography. Nor do the genealogies of this historical character and of the epic character, Ceṅkuṭṭuvan, agree in the least. According to the *Patirruppattu* version Vēl-Keḻu-Kuṭṭuvan was the son of Neḍuñchēralātan and Maṇakkiḻḻi, a Chōḻa princess. Aḍiyārkkunallār, the commentator of *Cilappadikāram*, says he was the son of Neḍuñchēralātan and Naṟcōṇai, the daughter of திகழொளி ஞாயிற்றேழ்பரி நெடுந்தேர்ச்சோழன் *i.e.*, உருவப்பஃறேர் இளஞ்சேட்சென்னி. Thus the two Kuṭṭuvans had two different mothers, unless we take 'Maṇakiḻḻi' and 'Naṟcōṇai' as referring to one queen. Further, their identification will scarcely fit in with the facts of contemporary Chōḻa history. If Ceṅkuṭṭuvan, *i.e.*, Vēl-Keḻuṭṭuvan by the hypothesis,

seems to have been killed by the Chēra king Peruñchēral Irumporai and his kingdom annexed. Nannan II, probably a grandson of Nannan I, was defeated and sent into exile by Kaḷaṅkāykkaṇṇi Nārmuḍi-Chēral. Thus was Pūḻināḍu, the coastal region which extended north up to Tuḻunāḍu, finally annexed to the Chēra dominion. Perunaḷḷi, the king of Kaṇḍīram,—a place probably situated about the Sattimangalam Pass leading from the Mysore plateau into Coimbatore—appears to have been praised for liberal gifts by, among other poets, one Kākkai Pāṭiniyār Naccellaiyār. The poetess's *name received the singular addition Kākkaipāṭini* from the accident of her mentioning in a verse the crow's cry as a prognostication of a guest's arrival! Another important circumstance which I cannot but notice with reference to this poetess is that one of her beautiful similes appears to have been borrowed by a later and greater genius and set in his justly celebrated work. I refer to the famous author of *Kuṟaḷ*. The original of the fine couplet,

> ஈன்ற பொழுதிற் பெரிதுவக்குந் தன்மகனைச்
> சான்றோ னெனக்கேட்ட தாய்,

is doubtless contained in the last line of the following stanza:

> நரம்பெழுந் துலறிய நிரம்பா மென்றோண்
> முளரி மருங்கின் முதியோள் சிறுவன்
> படையழிந்து மாறின னென்றுபலர் கூற
> மண்டமர்க் குடைந்தன னாயி னுண்டவென்
> முலையறுத் திடுவென் யானெனச் சினைஇக்
> கொண்ட வாளொடு படுபிணம் பெயராச்
> செங்களந் துழவுவோள் சிதைந்து வேறாகிய
> படுமகன் கிடக்கை காணூஉ
> ஈன்ற ஞான்றினும் பெரிதுவந் தனளே.
>
> —*Puṟam.*, S. 278.

were the son of Naṟcōṇai, the sister of Karikālan the Great, he should come in the generation which immediately succeeds that of Karikālan the Great and his father Neḍuñchēralātan should appear as Karikālan's contemporary. But both the Chēra kings stand two generations higher up in the Tables. This fact alone is sufficient to establish the unteuability of identifying Ceṅkuṭṭuvan with Vēl-Keḻu-Kuṭṭuvan.

The natural setting of the thought and phrasing in the piece of the ancient authoress and their ethical setting in the *Kuṟaḷ* must settle the question of priority. I cannot believe that this coincidence is accidental and is an instance of 'great wits jumping together'. Tiruvaḷḷuvar seems to have taken the gem from the ancient poem and given it a finer setting.

Another chief also, Perumpēkan, the king of 'Vaiyāvi', identified with the modern Palney Hills in the Madura District, must here be mentioned. He comes into prominence in connection with a domestic affair, which would not have reached us but for the zealous mediation of a number of poets. Perumpēkan had a wife named Kaṇṇaki and after living happily with her for some time he seems to have deserted her for some other lover or courtesan, who had caught him in her meshes. This misconduct on Perumpēkan's part brought about an estrangement between himself and his wife Kaṇṇaki and thereafter he was not even on visiting terms with her. The open amours of a ruler like Pēkan and his harsh treatment of his spouse must have given rise to much unseemly public talk. A number of poets, among whom we find the leading poets Paraṇar and Kapilar, moved by sympathy for the injured wife as well as by their affection and regard for the reputation of their patron Pēkan, came forward and exhorted the ruler to receive back Kaṇṇaki into his favour. Whether the erring king was in any way brought to his senses by this honourable intercession of the poets is not known.[1] Unlike the later Kaṇṇaki, who is evidently a character created to answer a floating tradition, Kaṇ-

(1) This incident, from a chapter of ancient Tamil history, may in a manner have supplied the initial *motif* for the *Cilappadikāram* story of later days. Apart from the similarity of the names of the hero and heroine —Kovalan being taken as a variant of Ko-vallān, the strong king,—the episode of separation between the husband and wife brought about by a courtesan is too striking to be omitted. Poets get their materials from diverse sources and fashion them in many different forms. Take for instance, the Tirumāvuṇṇi incident alluded to in *Naṟ.*, S. 216, who can say that it has not supplied Iḷango-Aḍigaḷ with another striking episode for his story?

ṉaki, the disconsolate wife of Pēkan, was undoubtedly a real historical character who had to suffer the slights and humiliations heaped on her by an imperious and faithless husband and whose sufferings would in time have given birth to that tradition itself. We are, however, more concerned with Pēkan's time than with his domestic felicities. That he belonged to this generation need hardly be doubted nor is there any scope for shifting Perunaḷḷi's time in the tables. Viccikkō and Iruṅkō Vēḷ, Princes of Vicci and Iruṅkō, to whom Kapilar is reported to have taken Pāri's daughters, may belong to this generation. So densely, however, has later tradition gathered round the name of Pāri, that it is almost impossible to separate fact from fiction in that pathetic story of Pāri's downfall and numerous other incidents that followed it. The whole must be separately studied and interpreted.

Link-names.

The personages of this generation are held together by the names of Paraṇar, Peruṅkuṉṟūr Kiḻār, Arisil Kiḻār, Kapilar, Vanparaṇar appearing as the lateral links almost throughout, and as a means of linear connection with the next generation, we have Peruṅkuṉṟūr Kiḻār and Kākkaipāṭiniyār Naccellaiyār. With these we have the known relationship of Uruva-pah-tēr-Iḷañcēṭceṉṉi with his son and successor Karikālan the Great.

THE SIXTH GENERATION.

Karikalan the Great's Period.

The Chola line: Karikalan II.

38. In coming to the time of Karikāla Chōḻa the Great, we come to a turning point in the history of that dynasty. Tradition, which is a blind dame at best if we have not the eyes to guide her foot-steps in the proper direction, has woven round this great figure many legends. It has been responsible for many whimsical stories for explaining away his strange name. But so far as the second

Karikālan is concerned no mystery need attach to his name. He bore it probably because it was his grandfather's name. How entirely baseless is the legend of the 'burnt leg' in respect of our great hero needs no further elucidation. If these fantastic stories should gain in significance and relevancy, they have to be bodily taken and grafted on the first Karikālan the 'Pasumpūṇ-Cenni' of Paraṇar's lines. Since we are aware that a good many ancient legends[1] are etymological at bottom having arisen to explain away some name or other, their explanation of facts and events cannot for that matter be convincing. Instead of explaining those facts and events, the legends themselves owe to them their origin and explanation; they are in short wholly *ex post facto* and should never be mistaken for real explanations. In the present instance, the name Karikālan, the origin of which is still wrapped up in mystery, must have excited the curiosity of later minds and driven them on to coin new and fanciful explanations. Setting aside the etymological constructions of Karikālan's name, tradition is strong in maintaining that Karikālan's succession to the throne after his father's death did not take place uncontested. He had to face many enemies and get rid of many obstacles from his path. In this we are assured that he had the strong support of Irumpiḍarttalaiyār, his maternal uncle, who held a high office under the Pāṇḍiya king of that time. It was quite possible that the Pāṇḍiya king, Palsālai-Mudukuḍumi-Peruvaḷudi, lent his powerful support to Karikālan by allowing the intercession of his official Irumpiḍarttalaiyār

(1) As a striking and amusing instance of such etymological fabrications, I shall extract the following:

"The Nyāya-Kōṣa mentions two legends to account for the name Akṣapāda as applied, according to it, to Gautama. It is said that Gautama was so deeply absorbed in philosophical contemplation that one day during his walks, he fell into a well, out of which he was rescued with great difficulty. God therefore mercifully provided him with a second pair of eyes in his feet, to protect the sage from further mishaps. This is a ridiculous story manufactured merely to explain the word "Akṣapāḍa" as composed of 'Akṣa' (eye) and 'Pāda' (feet)".—Dr. Satischandra Vidyabhusana's, *History of Indian Logic*, p. 48.

and the interest of such a powerful sovereign must undoubtedly have turned the scales largely in favour of the distressed Chōḻa king.

Considering the absence of any amicable relation between the Kiḷḷi and the Cenni branches, the whole trouble about Karikālan's succession to the throne may very well be ascribed to the intrigues of the members of the Kiḷḷi branch. By their successful machinations Karikālan must have been incarcerated for a period; but it was of little avail. He escaped from his prison in time and with the help of his friends fought his way to the throne and got it. Both *Porunarāṟṟuppaḍai* and *Paṭṭinappālai*, compositions by two contemporary poets, included later in the *Pattuppāṭṭu* collection (the Ten Idylls), give us this picture of events. Excepting the stray pieces of the poets appearing in *Puṟanāṉūṟu*, these are by far the most authoritative sources of information about the period of Karikālan the Great. Inclusive of the authors of the two poems mentioned above, half-a-dozen poets have sung about the great king and his exploits. He was one of the most successful of the empire-builders of his time. Not only did he extend his conquests far and wide but also worked hard to give his subjects the blessings of peace and plenty. He seems to have cleared up many forest regions in the north and encouraged colonisation on a scale not even attempted by any of his predecessors. Excavation of tanks and execution of other works of irrigation were also attended to. He renewed the fortifications of Uṟaiyūr and beautified that city with many architectural buildings. Development of internal trade and foreign commerce too did not escape his attention. In short, with the supreme courage, daring and skill of a military genius, he seems to have combined the gentle virtues of liberality, love of justice, and a deep attachment to the interests of his people. Till his time the Tamil kings were not so much courted by the poets as the so-called minor chiefs were. Many a

poet makes uncomplimentary comparisons between the unbounded liberality of the chiefs and the self-centred existence and pomp of the Tamil kings who would not deign to patronise the minstrels. But with Karikālan the Great, a new era dawned for letters. His unstinted patronage drew round him a brilliant group of poets of the first order and brought about the first efflorescence of Tamil literature. Longer compositions on set themes take their rise in his reign and to these earliest rills undoubtedly must be ascribed the glory of having fed at the source the broad stream of the present-day Tamil literature. He encouraged the performance of Yāgas by the few Brahmans whom he could invite for the purpose and opened the way for planting the first seeds of the Aryan religion in the Tamil country. These are the few facts one may gather from the early poems, regarding this great sovereign of the Chōḻa line and if the opinion of later generations furnishes any gauge for measuring the greatness of a person, the mere fact that posterity could not conceive of the ancient line of the Chōḻas without Karikālan the Great as its central figure must be taken as sufficient evidence of the greatness and glory of this ancient hero. After a long and brilliant reign he breathed his last in Kurāppaḷḷi. Thenceforward he was known as Kurāppaḷḷi-tunciya-Perum-Tiru-Māvaḷavan.

The Pandiya line: Palsalai Mudukudumi Peruvaludi, (alias) Palyagasalai Mudukudumi Peruvaludi, (alias) Velliyambalattu-tunciya-Peruvaludi.

39. Poet Kārikkaṇṇanār of Kāvirippūmpaṭṭinam has composed a stanza on the occasion of Karikālan II and Veḷḷiyambalattu-tuñciya-Peruvaḻudi, sitting together in a friendly *tete-a-tete* and gently advised them to continue in their amicable alliance and be a source of strength to each other. I am inclined to identify this Veḷḷiyambalattu-tuñciya-Peruvaḻudi with Palyāgasālai Mudukuḍumi Peruvaḻudi, on the ground that there could be only one Pāṇḍiya king to come between Neḍuñceḻiyan II

and Neḍuñceḻiyan III in the Tables. The general practice of coining a new name for a king from the place where he died should be noted and we should not be led away by such new names to create new personalities to answer them. For instance, Celvakkaḍuṅkō-Āḻiyātan gets a new name after his death, Cikkaṟ-paḷḷi-tuñciya-Celvakkaḍuṅkō. Karikālan II, *alias* Perumtirumāvaḷavan, comes to be known after his death at Kurāppaḷḷi as Kurāppaḷḷi-tuñciya-Perum-Tiru-Māvaḷavan. In the same way, Palsālai Mudukuḍumi Peruvaḻudi who happened to die at Veḷḷiyambalam was thereafter known as Veḷḷiyambalattu-tuñciya-Peruvaḻudi. I am strengthened in this identification by another material consideration furnished by *Maduraikkānci*, a piece composed in honour of Talaiyālaṅkānattu-Ceru-Venṟa-Pāṇḍiyan of the next generation. There the poet evidently refers to the father and grandfather of his patron in the lines:

> "பல்சாலை முதுகுடுமியி
> னல்வேள்வித் துறைபோகிய
> தொல்லாணை நல்லாசிரியர்
> புணர்கூட்டுண்ட புகழ்சால் சிறப்பி
> னிலந்தரு திருவி னெடியோன் போல
> ....உறைமதி"

Poet Neṭṭimaiyār's lines in *Puṟam.*, S. 9, will show that Nilamtaru-tiruvil-Pāṇḍiyan who celebrated the sea-festival on the shores of the western sea after the conquest of the Āayi country was a predecessor of Palsālai Mudukuḍumi Peruvaḻudi. In wishing long life to his patron he prays that the king's days should be as many as the sands in the Pahṟuḷi river, a river which owed its existence to the zeal, keen foresight and wisdom of his predecessor. Thus certain facts of Tamil literature and the order of events in the Synchronistic Tables alike justify the identification of the two variously-named kings, *viz.*, Palsālai Mudukuḍumi Peruvaḻudi and Veḷḷiyambalattu-tuñciya Peruvaḻudi. The three poets, Kārikiḻār, Neṭṭimaiyār and Neḍumpalliyattanār, who sing of Palsālai Mudukuḍumi

Peruvaḻudi stand disconnected with the Tables and hence offer us little help in the matter. At any rate, their combined testimony does in no way stand against the identification I have herein adopted. Irumpiḍarttalaiyār, the uncle of Karikālan, whose real name is lost to posterity but is replaced by one coined from the descriptive phrase 'Irumpiḍarttalai' (இரும்பிடர்த்தலை) occurring in his stanza which has come down to us, refers to the same Pāṇḍiyan by another descriptive appellation Karuṅkai-oḷ-vāḷ-perum-peyar-Vaḻudi, *i.e.*, the Vaḻudi with the hard hand bearing a shining sword:

> "மருந்தில் கூற்றத் தருந்தொழில் சாயாக்
> கருங்கை யொள்வாட் பெரும்பெயர் வழுதி"
>
> —*Puṟam.*, S. 3.

This Pāṇḍiyan is said to have been a terrible warrior, a chip of the old hero, the great Pasumpūṇ Pāṇḍiyan, the conqueror of the Āayi country. In the words of the poets he carried devastation into the enemy's countries in all his wars.

40. Yet some poems composed in his honour contain references to his having performed Yāgas with the aid of the Brahman priests. Poems of a like tenor appear also in respect of his Chōḻa contemporary Karikālan the Great. I extract here a few verses which sound a clear religious note and convey to us the impression that those old-time warriors were zealous upholders of the Vedic Yāgas:

Some doubts.

> "பணியிய ரத்தைநின் குடையே முனிவர்
> முக்கட் செல்வர் நகர்வலஞ் செயற்கே
> யிறைஞ்சுக பெருமநின் சென்னி சிறந்த
> நான்மறை முனிவ ரேந்துகை யெதிரே"
>
> —*Puṟam.*, S. 6.

> "நற்பனுவ னால்வேதத்
> தருஞ்சீர்த்திப் பெருங்கண்ணுறை
> நெய்ம்மலி யாவுதி பொங்கப் பன்மாண்
> வீயாச் சிறப்பின் வேள்வி முற்றி

யூப நட்ட வியன்களம் பலகொல்
யாபல கொல்லோ பெரும"

—*Puṟam.*, S. 15.

"அறமறக் கண்ட நெறிமா ணவையத்து
முறைநற் கறியுநர் முன்னுறப் புகழ்ந்த
தூவியற் கொள்கைத் துகளறு மகளிரொடு
பருதி யுருவிற் பலபடைப் புரிசை
யெருவை நுகர்ச்சி யூப நெடுந்தூண்
வேத வேள்வித் தொழின்முடித் ததூஉ
மறிந்தோன் மன்ற வறிவுடை யாளன்".

—*Puṟam.*, S. 224.

Whether these verses are genuine and give a correct picture of the religious leaning of those ancient Tamil kings is just possible to doubt. Take poet Kārikiḻār. What does Kāri denote in this name? If it were a place-name—as I suspect it is not—the phrase Kārikiḻār would go on all fours with ancient usage; for, I am sure, in the usage of the early poets, one solitary instance of Kiḻār being attached to a personal name cannot be quoted. It always goes with a place-name. If Kārikiḻār were a genuine name, we should assume the existence of a town or village under the name Kāri[1] and I do not know how far we would be justified in such an assumption. It is not unlikely that Kārikiḻār may be a later creation, in whose mouth a preposterous direction is put which no living poet

(1) In his biographical notes about Kārikiḻār Pandit Mahamahopadyaya V. Swaminatha Aiyar says that there was a village by this name 'Kāri' in Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam and it is now known as Rāmagiri. It is not clear from what source the ancient name for Rāmagiri was ascertained. Even granting the existence of a village with this peculiar name in Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam, it would hardly serve to identify this particular poet, a contemporary of one of the oldest Pāṇḍiya kings of the time of Karikālan the Great. Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam then was a forest region entirely outside the sway of the Tamil kings. It is inconceivable how a poet could have hailed from that quarter so early as this. The attempted identification is clearly based upon much later facts and is historically of little value. Not stopping here the learned Pandit introduces facts of still much later period as for instance Kārināyanār of *Periyapurāṇam* and Kāriyār of *Tiruviḷaiyāḍal-purāṇam*. These, however, only go to confirm my view about the personal character of the name 'Kari'. But why should we come down to later history when the Sangam Literature itself furnishes many examples, *e.g.*, Kāri of Muḷḷoor, Malaiyamān Tirumuḍi-Kāri, poet Kāri-Kaṇṇan, etc.

to a living sovereign would ever have the hardihood to address. Take also the couple of references as regards the Yajña post and its detailed description. Could these not have been inserted at the time of the Hindu religious reaction to give the impression that Aryan Hinduism had come into the Tamil country even before the Aryan heterodox systems and had secured the support and patronage of two of the most prominent of the ancient kings? In the circumstances of the case, the interpolators could not have pitched on more illustrious kings than Palsālai Mudukuḍumi for the Pāṇḍiya line and Karikālan the Great for the Chōḻa. The change of Palsālai[1] into Palyāgasālai adds to the general suspicion. We must further take into account the thorough manner in which the Buddhist and Jaina vestiges were destroyed or converted to other uses, during the period of the Hindu reaction. Jain tradition is strong that most of their manuscripts were committed to the flames and their Chaityas converted into Hindu temples. Dr. Vincent Smith writes in a foot-note in p. 473 of his *Early History of India*: "It seems tolerably certain that some of them were converted at a later date to Brahmanical use. This is clearly the case with the Buddhist apsidal Chaitya hall at Chazarla in Guntur District, converted into a Saiva temple of late Pallava style." He then refers to the late Mr. T. A. Gopinatha Rao's 'Bouddha Vestiges in Kānchipura' and writes: "In twelve hours the author discovered five images of Buddha, two being inside the Kāmākshi temple, which probably occupies the site of a Buddhist Tāra Temple, etc." Then in p. 495, about Mahēndra Varma's conversion to the Saiva faith, he says: "The king, after his conversion, destroyed the large Jain monastery at Pātali-

(1) *Salai*, in the usage of the early times, was also the name of a monastic cave-bed to which the Buddhists and other monks retired for rest and meditation. In North India I find mentioned a mountain with such a cave-bed known as Indra Sāla Giri. One might consider Palsālai in Muḍukuḍumi's name as denoting a sovereign who created numerous cave-beds for the monks and nuns of the heterodox sects. But we should beware not to spin out history from a name.

puttiram in South Arcot, replacing it by a Saiva fane." These are only a few instances to show the mentality of the orthodox reactionists in effacing the marks and monuments of the older faiths. Would it be unreasonable then to suppose that the old literature too should have been considerably tampered with by the zeal and bigotry of the orthodox party? To add to the general suspicion regarding the 'Yāgas' none of the longer compositions such as *Porunārārruppaḍai, Paṭṭinappālai,* and *Maduraikkāñci* has a word to say about such rites. If those kings had really celebrated the Yāgas, the contemporary poets would certainly have described them in these longer compositions. Their silence regarding this Vedic rite—a new introduction in the Tamil land—is inexplicable. Moreover, the conditions of that period do not seem to favour any such religious activity. Weighty as these considerations are, I cannot see my way to lightly brush aside these poems as interpolations. That can be done only after subjecting their materials to a more searching critical examination from the standpoint of religion than has been undertaken yet. Still, I have called attention to these doubts to emphasize the high probability of some poems having been composed and added to the genuine ones at the time of the redaction of these collections carried out at about the dawn of the religious epoch. Even as they stand these references only prove that the first introduction of this Aryan religious rite cannot be pushed earlier than this period.

The Chera line:
(1) Cheraman Kudakko Ilancheral Irumporai (alias) Ilancheral Irumporai, (alias) Kudakko-Cheral Irumporai.
(2) Adu-Kotpattu-Cheralatan.

41. The two Chēra contemporaries of Karikālan the Great were Chēramān Kuḍakkō Iḷañchēral Irumporai, the son of Peruñchēral Irumporai of the previous generation and Āḍukōṭpāṭṭu Chēralātan, the younger brother of Kaḷaṅkāykaṇṇi Nārmuḍi Chēral. Kuḍakkō Iḷañchēral Irumporai, *i.e.*, the young Chēra king called Irumporai, was the king of

Kuḍanāḍu, and he was celebrated by poet Peruṅkunṟūr-Kiḻār—the same poet who sang of Karikālan's father too. This poet's life seems to have overlapped those two generations and furnishes us with a strong linear link. We learn from *Patiṟṟuppattu* that this Chēra king held his court in his capital Naṟavu, the 'Naoura' of the *Periplus* and the 'Nitria' of *Pliny*, situated to the north of Tyndis or Toṇḍi. Yule has correctly identified this place as Mangalore on the banks of the river Nētrāvati. As in the case of the name 'Damirica', which instead of being derived direct from the Tamil word Tamiḻagam is sought to be derived from the Sanskrit form 'Dramidaka', here also Nitria's original, they say, should be Nētrāvati. In explaining Tamil names of that far-off period, the attempt to derive them from a supposed Sanskrit original is really putting the cart before the horse. The name Nētrāvati itself should be taken as a later form and its origin traced to the ancient Tamil name Naṟavu. The earlier testimony of the *Periplus* itself, which gives the form 'Naoura', leaves us no other alternative. It is clear, then, that by this time the Chēra dominions had come to embrace the South Canara District in the West Coast.

As regards the next sovereign, Āṭu-Kōṭpāṭṭu-Chēralātan, it might be urged that he, being a brother of Kaḷaṅkāykkaṇṇi Nārmuḍi Chēral of the previous generation, should be placed with the latter in that generation and not where he now stands. Two considerations, however, have weighed with me in the present disposition. First, his regnal years which come to 38 according to *Patiṟṟuppattu* exceed those of his predecessor by 13 years and cover more than the normal period of a generation, *viz.*, 25 years; and secondly, the previous generation has already two Chēra kings of one and the same family wielding sway and nothing would be gained by overcrowding that generation with too many rulers. Further, Vēl Keḻu Kuṭṭuvan's reign according to *Patiṟṟuppattu* extended over 55 years, that is, it practically covered a little over two generations. Even if we allow that as an exceptional case, the

reigns of both Kaḷaṅkāykkaṇṇi and Āṭukōṭpāṭṭu Chēral would in succession slightly exceed that figure and come to only 63 years. Moreover, the arrangement of the poems in *Patiṟṟuppattu* does not seem to be arbitrary. It follows a chronological order in respect of the two lines of the Chēra kings therein treated, Udiyan Chēral's descendants claiming the second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth 'Tens' in order and Antuvan Chēral's successors, *i.e.*, the Karuvūr or eastern branch, being given the seventh eighth and ninth 'Tens' of that work. By this also, Āṭu Kōṭpāṭṭu Chēral has to come at the lower end of the western branch of the Chēras. In these circumstances I preferred fixing Āṭukōṭpāṭṭu Chēral's reign to the generation of Karikālan the Great.

The name of this Chēra king furnishes another interesting instance of a curious 'Etymological Myth'. This particular sovereign derives his name evidently from his practice of celebrating his victories in the battle-field by a war dance with drawn uplifted swords in which he also took part with the common soldier. This is clear from the following references in *Patiṟṟuppattu*:

"சுடரும் பாண்டிற் றிருநாறு விளக்கத்து
முழாவிமிழ் துணங்கைக்குத் தழூஉப்புணை யாகச்
சிலைப்புவல் லேற்றிற் றலைக்கை தந்துநீ
நளிந்தனை வருத லுடன்றன ளாகி."

—*Patiṟṟu.*, S. 52.

" வலம்படு முரசந் துவைப்ப வாளுயர்த்
திலங்கும் பூணன் பொலங்கொடி யுழிஞையன்
மடம்பெரு மையி னுடன்றுமேல் வந்த
வேந்துமெய்ம் மறந்த வாழ்ச்சி
வீந்துகு போர்க்களத் தாடுங் கோவே."

—*Patiṟṟu*, S. 56.

"துணங்கை யாடிய வலம்படு கோமான்."

—*Patiṟṟu*, S. 57.

The first extract describes an incident in the life of this Chēra king and refers to a fine situation it brought about. The Chēra queen, being desirous of welcoming

back her lord from the battle-field with all joyous ostentation, was holding in her hand the crimson *Kuvaḷai* flower to pelt him with, as a mark of her love and regard. To her great consternation however she found her royal spouse approaching her engaged in the unsightly dance and had to desist from carrying out her tender plan. With these literary memorials before us there can hardly be any two opinions on the significance of his name 'Āṭukōṭpāṭṭu Chēralātan'. And yet we find later-day myth-makers missing the key of explanation, and coining a story to suit the phrase Āṭukōḷ (ஆடுகோள்) which unfortunately means 'capture of sheep' also. Forthwith the story of capturing a flock of sheep in the forest of Daṇḍakāraṇya was brought into shape in all its details and even the destination and distribution of the herd were therein specified with absolute precision !

> "தண்டா ரணியத்துக் கோட்பட்ட வருடையைத்
> தொண்டியுட் டந்து கொடுப்பித்துப் பார்ப்பார்க்குக்
> கபிலையொடு குடநாட் டோரூ ரீத்து"
>
> —*Patigam* to *Patiṟṟu., VI.*

To make the gift of sheep acceptable to the Brahmin-donees, a village each and also cows were added. How incongruous that a great king like the then Chēra sovereign should go all the way to Daṇḍakāraṇya to wage war for a flock of sheep and how still more incongruous that this petty incident should have been considered dignified enough for perpetuation in the cognomen of the king! With all its ludicrousness this story is even now passed on as serious history by certain school of scholars, who have no excuse for being so uncritical in examining later literary data. Although foreign to the purpose on hand I have dealt with this incident as a typical case, to show how valuable historical truths in ancient Tamil history should sometimes be dug out of the worthless debris heaped on them by the myth-makers of later generations. Turning to the subject proper we find the poetess Kākkaipāṭiniyār Nacceḷḷaiyār, who appeared in the previous generation, composing one of the 'Tens' in the "Ten Tens" in honour

of this particular Chēra king. This fact gives us an additional linear link.

The Chiefs.

42. One Iruṅgōvēḷ is said to have been conquered by Karikālan the Great, according to the account in *Paṭṭinappālai.* This appellation does not seem to be a proper name. It may be taken as a generic title for all the chiefs of 'Iruṅgō'. If so, a chief of that line in all probability may be considered as the person to whom Kapilar is reported to have taken Pāri's daughters for arranging their marriage, supposing that event to be historical. Two other officers, whose titles indicate that they were commanders in the employ of the great Chōḻa king, Ēnādi Tirukkiḷḷi, and Ēnādi Tirukkuṭṭuvan, appear to have flourished in this generation. Karikālan the Great seems to have instituted titles of honour to be bestowed on his officers and, from this, one could well read the far-sighted policy pursued by that monarch for the first time to win and hold the affection and attachment of his officers. Like Napoleon this great warrior of the Tamil country, who had definitely embarked on a policy of conquest of the surrounding territories, seems to have surrounded himself with a select company of gifted warriors like himself and by their aid carried out all his plans of conquest to a victorious close. It was during his reign that those troublesome northerners, the Aruvāḷars, who could not meekly submit to the Chōḻa yoke but rose now and then in open rebellion, were finally subjugated and made peaceful citizens of the state. By a steady policy of colonising the land with settlers drawn from his old subject population even more than by the might of his arms did he carry out the great object of reclaiming the forest kingdom of Arcot to the ranks of civilized life. The Pallava rulers who appeared in this theatre later on had only to build on the foundations securely laid by this great Chōḻa ruler and to complete the work begun by him at least three centuries earlier.

Link-names.

It will be seen that the names of poets, Kārikkaṇṇanār of Kāvirippaṭṭinam and Māḍalan Maduraikkumaranār of Eṟiccilūr serve as lateral links, and Māḍalan Maduraikkumaranār again and Dāmōdaranār, a physician of Uṟaiyūr, supply the linear links with the succeeding generation.

THE SEVENTH GENERATION.

CEDCENNI NALAM-KILLI PERIOD.

The Chola line: Cedcenni Nalam-killi (alias) Ilavantikaippalli-tunciya-Nalam-killi.

43. When Karikālan the Great died, the empire he built up was not allowed to quietly pass into the hands of his son and successor. The old Cenni-Kiḷḷi rivalry which the great king himself had to face and overcome before he came to the throne appears to have again cropped up. It was only driven underground for a time by the genius of Karikālan the Great whose military power and statesmanship were of too high an order to be set at naught by his rivals. But no sooner was the strong arm of that monarch removed than the forces of disorder skilfully engineered by the claimants of the Kiḷḷi line made themselves felt in an open 'war of succession'. Neḍum-kiḷḷi, the leader of the Kiḷḷi family, contested the throne with Karikālan's son Cēḍcenni Nalam-kiḷḷi who was evidently staying at Kāvirippaṭṭinam at that time. Neḍum-kiḷḷi was besieged at Uṟaiyūr by Nalam-kiḷḷi, and Kōvūr Kiḻār, an eminent poet, seems to have intervened to bring about a friendly understanding between the contending princes. His stanza composed for the occasion admits us to the inwardness of events in that critical period of Chōḻa history. Kōvūr Kiḻār appeals as follows to the sense of family prestige and the tie of family affection which the combatants might still possess:

"இரும்பனை வெண்டோடு மலைந்தோ னல்லன்
கருஞ்சினை வேம்பின் றெரியலோ னல்ல

ளின்ன கண்ணியு மார்மிடைந் தன்றே, நின்னொடு
பொருவோன் கண்ணியு மார்மிடைந் தன்றே
யொருவீர் தோற்பினுந் தோற்பதுங் குடியே
யிருவீர் வேற லியற்கையு மன்றே, அதனாற்
குடிப்பொரு ளன்றுநுஞ் செய்தி கொடித்தேர்
நும்மோ ரன்ன வேந்தர்க்கு
மெய்ம்மலி யுவகை செய்யுமிவ் விகலே."

—*Puram.*, *S.* 45.

That the fighting princes were not brothers is plain enough from the poet's words. If they were, he would have strongly driven home his arguments by condemning a fratricidal war. All that the poet could urge was that both the princes belonged to the Chōḻa family and wore the *ātti* garland as a token of that descent. Further, the poet had such a keen sense of justice and fair play that he distinctly avoided being a partisan of any one prince in the struggle. He knew each had as good a title as the other for the throne. Neḍum-kiḷḷi, probably a descendant of Vēl-pahṟ-taḍakkai-Peruviṟaṟkiḷḷi, was a scion of the royal house founded by Tittan, the captor of Uṟaiyūr. He had a right by direct descent from the founder of the Uṟaiyūr throne. On the other hand, Cēḍcenni Nalam-kiḷḷi was the son of Karikālan II and grandson of Uruva-pah-tēr-Iḷañcēḍcenni, both these previous rulers having been in actual possession of the throne of Uṟaiyūr and done much for the expansion and development of the Chōḻa kingdom. Thus Nalam-kiḷḷi had a right by virtue of descent from the two immediate *de facto* rulers of Uṟaiyūr. When the individual rights of the warring princes were so nicely balanced, the poet could not take up the cause of either party and sacrifice his own sense of justice. As a matter of fact, the poet appears to have adopted a middle course and condemned neither for putting forward a claim to the throne. So far as that was concerned, he put them on the same level but deprecated their fight as affecting family prestige and honour and as giving a fillip to the other kings to gloat over their dissensions. Thus

then Kōvūr Kiḻār's stanza throws a flood of light on the Cenni-kiḷḷi rivalry I have alluded to in a previous section of this work. Whether the poet's appeals had any effect in pouring oil over the troubled waters of that domestic warfare we do not know; nor is any glimpse afforded us about the conditions which brought Cēḍcenni Nalam-kiḷḷi to the throne. That he was the immediate successor of Karikālan the Great admits of little doubt. Four poets attached themselves to him, *viz.*, Māḍalan Maduraikkumaranār of Ericcilūr, Mudukaṇṇan Cāttanār of Uṟaiyūr, Ālattūr Kiḻār and Kōvūr Kiḻār and have left memorials in their verses of his courage and heroism. The signal victory of conquering the "Seven Forts" (ஏழெயில்) stands to the credit of this king. It would be incorrect to suppose that the Seven Forts were wrested from the Pāṇḍiya king of that time. The probabilities are that the forts should have been in possession of the forest chiefs, whose territories still lay between the Chōḷa and the Pāṇḍiya kingdoms and should have been captured from them. Even at a still later stage in the Pāṇḍiya history we hear of Ukkira Peruvaḻudi storming the great fort called 'Kānappēreyil'. Such skirmishes indulged in by the Tamil rulers now and then show that within Tamiḻagam itself, as in its northern borders, there were still a number of Nāga chieftains stubbornly resisting the Tamil kings and maintaining their ancient independence under the shelter of their skilfully-constructed forts and earthworks.

Neḍum-kiḷḷi who died at Kāriyāṟu and Kiḷḷi-Vaḷavan who breathed his last at Kuṟāppaḷḷi were two other Chōḷa princes of this time, about whom Kōvūr Kiḻār has left some verses. These princes must have been prevailed upon to acquiesce in Nalam-kiḷḷi's mounting the throne. I am inclined to hold that this politic ruler after establishing himself on the throne must have assumed the name Nalam-kiḷḷi, the good Kiḷḷi, along with his original name Cēḍcenni to prevent the recurrence of such family

squabbles in the future.[1] Since this memorable reign the ancient distinctions of Cenni and Kiḷḷi have been obliterated and the hatchet of that obscure family feud buried for ever. If the *Cilappadikāram* epic could be credited with containing some shreds of true tradition in the highly imaginative fabric of its story, Vēl Keḻu Kuṭṭuvan might be taken to have intervened in bringing about an amicable settlement in this war of Chōḻa succession. To render such an intervention possible, we have to assume that Vēl Keḻu Kuṭṭuvan [(*alias*) Chenkuṭṭuvan according to *Cilappadikāram*] lived a little lower down the generations as arranged in the Tables. Both he and his father Neḍuñchēralātan, who are given very long reigns by *Patiṟṟuppattu, i.e.*, 55+58=113 years, should be made to cover at the least four generations in order that Vēl Keḻu Kuṭṭuvan might be in a position to help his brother-in-law Nalam-kiḷḷi. How far that could be allowed is a point wherein even scholarly opinions must legitimately differ.

The Pandiya line: Talaiyalankanattu-Ceru-Venra Nedunceliyan, (alias) Nedunceliyan III.

44. Another great warrior appears in the Pāṇḍiya line in this generation. He takes a surname by the famous victory won by him at Talaiyālaṅkānam. He was quite a youth when he succeeded his father Mudukuḍumi and this circumstance seems to have tempted the other sovereigns and chieftains to measure swords with him and share his kingdom. Though young in years Neḍuñceḻiyan III happened to be more than a match for the enemy-confederacy and on the plains of Talaiyālaṅkānam, probably somewhere near Nīḍāmangalam in the

(1) Compare the following verses:

"கேட்ப வெந்தை சேட்சென்னி நலங்கிள்ளி"

—*Puṟam., S.* 27.

"சேட்சென்னி நலங்கிள்ளி கேட்குவன் கொல்லென"

—*Puṟam., S.* 225.

Tanjore District, routed their combined armies and won a brilliant victory. Four poets, Kallādanār, Kuḍapulaviyanār, Eḍaikkunṟūr Kiḻār and Māṅkuḍi Kiḻār, have celebrated the character and achievements of this hero, of whom Māṅkuḍi Kiḻār, otherwise known as Māṅkuḍi Marudan, has also composed *Maduraikkāñci,* one of the "Ten Idylls" in his honour. Like Karikālan the Great, whose example he seems to have emulated, Neḍuñceḻiyan III became a great patron of the poets. In one of his poems—for apparently he had also courted the Muses—he vows that any failure on his part to overcome his enemies should make him lose the high honour of being sung by Māṅkuḍi Marudan and other poets of his court:

"ஓங்கிய சிறப்பி னுயர்ந்த கேள்வி
மாங்குடி மருதன் றலைவ னாக
வுலகமொடு நிலைஇய பலர்புகழ் சிறப்பிற்
புலவர் பாடாது வரைகவென் னிலவரை"

—*Puram.*, S. 72.

These give some idea of the literary tastes of this king and his poetic *proteges*. The name of his capital Kūḍal, undergoes a transformation and puts on probably from this time or perhaps from Mudukuḍumi's period, the Sanskrit garb 'Mathurā'. At that period Mathura in North India was an important stronghold of the Jains and the first importation of the name into the south may have been under the Jaina auspices. But literary texts do not contain any direct evidence on this point. As suggested already, the history of religion should be taken up separately and studied in its entirety before we can hope for any reliable results in that direction.

None of the poets of this Pāṇḍiya king, however, happens to sing of any other sovereign in this generation. Their isolation would have been really perplexing in locating the victor of Talaiyālaṅkānam, if we had not other resources at our command. The testimony of *Maduraikkāñci* is positive in fixing the anteriority of Nilam-tarutiruvil-Pāṇḍiyan and Mudukuḍumi Peruvaḻudi to Neḍuñ-

celiyan III. Another circumstance also has been found helpful in deciding the matter. It will be seen that the next Pāṇḍiya king Ilavantikaippaḷḷi-tuñciya-Nanmāṟan is sung by two poets, Kārikkaṇṇanār of Kāvirippaṭṭinam and Marudan Iḷanāganār. Since one Kārikkaṇṇanār of Kavirippaṭṭinam appears in the previous generation as a contemporary of Veḷḷiyambalattu-tuñciya-Peruvaḻudi, it is but natural to place Ilavantikaippaḷḷi-tuñciya-Nanmāṟan in closest proximity to the Veḷḷiyambalattu-tuñciya-Peruvaḻudi's generation. But I have purposely refrained from that arrangement for this weighty reason: that Ilavantikaippaḷḷi-tuñciya-Nanmāṟan being sung by Marudan Iḷanāgan, a son of Māṅkuḍi Marudan, the poet should necessarily follow the generation of the victor of Talaiyālaṅkānam to whose court was attached the father-poet Māṅkuḍi Marudan. As a necessary result of this disposition the Kārikkaṇṇan, who appears in the third generation from that of his namesake—probably a grandfather of his—is designated in the Tables as Kārikkaṇṇan II. Thus Māṅkuḍi Marudan by his known relationship with Marudan Iḷanāgan and also by his poem *Maduraikkāñci* has helped us in fixing the place of the victor of Talaiyālaṅkānam in the Tables with tolerable certainty.

The Chera line: Cheraman Kuttuvan Kodai.

45. The double line of the Chēra kings, who are celebrated in *Patiṟṟuppattu* having come to a close by the previous generation, the Chēras who appear in this and succeeding generations should stand only on the evidence of the four primary works I have already referred to. Chēramān Kuṭṭuvan Kōdai finds his place in this generation by the verse of poet Māḍalan Maduraikkumaranār in *Puṟam.*, S. 54. He does not call for any special remarks.

The Chiefs.

46. Among the chiefs, Nakkīrar's verse (*Agam.*, S. 36) gives us Titiyan II, Eḻini III, Iruṅgōvēḷ II and Erumaiyūran, as the opponents of

Neduñceliyan III at the Talaiyālaṅkānam battle. Of these, Titiyan II may be taken as the successor of Atiyan of the Pothiyil kingdom and he probably took advantage of the confederacy to see whether he could get out of the Pāṇḍiya yoke. But the independence his predecessor had lost could not be won back from so formidable a foe as Neduñceliyan III. Talaiyālaṅkānam battle appears to have set its final seal on the fate of the once powerful Āayi kingdom. Poet Kallāḍanār's references bring into view a number of chieftains. Ambar Kiḻān Aruvandai (*Puṟam.*, S. 385), Poraiyārrukiḻān, (*Puṟam.*, S. 391), and Pulli, the chief of the Kalvar tribes in the Vēṅkaṭa Hill (*Agam.*, S. 83), may be assigned to this generation. Māṅkuḍi Kiḻār in *Puṟam.*, S. 396, sings of one Eḻini Ātan of Vāṭṭāṟu and he too may belong to this period. One Piṭṭan of Kudiraimalai sung by two poets, Dāmōdaranār, the physician of Uṟaiyūr (*Puṟam.*, S. 170) and Vaḍama Vaṇṇakkan Dāmōdaranār (*Puṟam.*, S. 172), should find a place here. It will be seen hereafter that this Piṭṭan was succeeded in the next two generations by Piṭṭan Koṟṟan probably his son and thereafter by Piṭṭan II probably his grandson. To distinguish Piṭṭan of this generation, the grandfather, from Piṭṭan, the grandson, I have designated them as Piṭṭan I and Piṭṭan II respectively.

Link-names.

This generation is internally held together by three lateral link-names, *viz.*, Kallāḍanār, Māṅkuḍi Kiḻār and Kōvūr Kiḻār; the linear-links connecting it with the next generation being also three. The known parental relationship of Māṅkuḍi Kiḻār *alias* Māṅkuḍi Marudan with Marudan Iḷanāgan is one of them. And the remaining two are Ālattūr Kiḻār and Kōvūr Kiḻār, whose lives overlap into the next generation. Among the chiefs, Piṭṭan being succeeded by Piṭṭan Koṟṟan and Eḻini Ātan by Ātan Eḻini may also supply subsidiary linear-links, if their relationship is properly understood and assumed.

THE EIGHTH GENERATION.

KULAMURRATTU-TUNCIYA-KILLI-VALAVAN PERIOD.

The Chola line: Kulamurrattu-tunciya-Killi-Valavan.

47. How Killi Valavan, the next Chōla king, was related to his predecessor is nowhere stated or even hinted. Yet we may infer from his name—for names supply important information of relationship in respect of Tamil kings—that he was the son of Nalam-killi and grandson of Karikālan the Great, who also was known as Perum-tiru-Māvalavan or Valavan simply without any of those adjuncts. In his patronage of poets, Killi Valavan appears to have surpassed all the other kings of his line or even of the other lines. So many as ten poets, of whom Idaikkādar[1] was one, gathered round him and added to the brilliance of his court. True to his descent he proved himself a worthy successor of the great Karikālan and carried the war to the gates of Chēra's capital city. He is reported to have laid siege to Karuvūr and reduced the Chēra power to insignificance. The contemporary Chēra king, 'Chēra of the Elephant Look', who had already suffered defeat and imprisonment by the Pāndiya victor of Talaiyālankānam, should have been dispossessed of his throne for some time by this great Chōla rival. An incident throwing a flood of light into the autocratic ways of these early kings may be mentioned here. This great warrior and patron of letters was on the point of executing the unoffending children of Malaiyamān, probably a descendant of Malaiyamān Tirumudi Kāri of the fourth generation, when Kōvūr Kilār, one of the leading poets of his court, intervened and by a pathetic appeal prevented the great king from blotting his escutcheon by such an act. The timely intervention of the poet does honour to this day to his great heart as well as to the noble profession he belonged to. Further biographical details of this king are omitted as they are not pertinent to our purpose.

(1) *Vide* Appendix VII: Note on Poet Idaikkādar.

The Pandiya line:
(1) Ilavantikaippalli-tunciya-Nanmaran.
(2) Kudakarattu-tunciya Maran Valudi.

48. The Pāṇḍiya line for this period shows the existence of two kings, *viz.*, Nanmāṟan, who died at Ilavantikaippaḷḷi and Māṟan Vaḻudi, who died at Kūḍākāram. Their relationship with their predecessor, the victor of Talaiyālaṅkānam, cannot be known. Both of them appear to have enjoyed the rule and may have succeeded to the throne at short intervals. Of these, Naṉmāṟan was sung by as many as five poets, Marudan Ilanāgan, the son of Māṅkuḍi Kiḻār of the previous generation, celebrating him as well as the other Pāṇḍiyan who died at Kūḍākāram. This is why both these rulers have been assigned to one and the same generation. Kārikkaṇṇār II of Kavirippaṭṭinam, another poet of this generation, should be kept distinct from his namesake of the period of Karikālan the Great. One might suggest that these two individuals should be merged into one and shifted to the centre of the previous generation so as to allow him to slightly overlap the preceding and succeeding generations. But such a shifting would leave the poet unconnected with the other personages of that generation. Hence I have chosen to leave each of these names to the generation to which it rightly belongs and thus avoid the confusion which might otherwise arise.

The Chera line: Yanaikkan-Mantaran-Cheral Irumporai, (alias) Mantaran Cheral Irumporai.

49. The Chēra of 'the Elephant look' who succeeded to the Chēra throne after a series of reverses appears to have been sung in high strains by four contemporary poets, Kuṟuṅkōḻiyūr Kiḻār, Kūḍalur Kiḻār, Poruntil Iḷaṅkīranār and Vaḍama Vaṇṇakka Peruñcāttanār. Their descriptions of their hero must, however, be taken with some reserve; for during his time both the Chōḻa and Pāṇḍiya thrones were occupied by great warriors against whom he could not have made any headway. The Chēra line had already begun to show signs of exhaustion

and its symptoms and causes need not be gone into at present.

The Chiefs.

50. Among the chiefs of this generation, Ciṟukuḍi Kiḻān, by name Paṇṇan, claims special mention. The great king Kiḷḷi Vaḷavan himself has composed a stanza in his honour (*Puram.*, S. 173). Some four other poets have also glorified him in their verses. Piṭṭan Koṟṟan of Kuḍiraimalai, probably a son of Piṭṭan of the previous generation, also comes in here. Ātan Eḻini, probably a son of Eḻini Ātan of the preceding generation, should be brought in here according to Aiyūr Muḍavanār's verse in *Agam*.. S. 216. Tāmān Tānṟikkōn or Tōnṟikkōn was another chief of this period. I have given these chieftains as no better than mere literary names for the present. They will become historical only when the geographical position of their territories becomes definitely fixed.

Link-names.

This generation contains the largest number of link-names, both lateral and linear. The lateral connection is supplied by (1) Vaḍama Vaṇṇakkan Peruñcāttanār, (2) Marudan Iḷanāganār, (3) Muḍavanār of Aiyūr, (4) Mūlam Kiḻār of Āvūr, (5) Nappasalaiyār of Māṟōkkam, and (6) Kōvūr Kiḻār; and the linear-links with the next generation by (1) Mūlam Kiḻār of Āvūr, (2) Marudan Iḷanāganār, (3) Nakkīrar, and (4) Tāyan Kaṇṇanār of Erukkāḍu.

THE NINTH GENERATION.

Rajasuyam Vetta Perunarkilli Period.

The Chola line: Rajasuyam Vetta Perunarkilli.

51. The next Chōḻa king was the great Naṟkiḷḷi, who celebrated the Rājasūya sacrifice. He seems to bear the name of his grandfather Nalam-kiḷḷi and may be taken as having succeeded to the prosperous empire his father Kiḷḷi Vaḷavan had consolidated by his

war and policy. The Chōḻa power must have risen nearly to its zenith for this king to have performed the great Rājasūya sacrifice, which is generally performed only by great conquerors or empire-builders. Avvaiyār, the famous poetess, celebrates this sacrifice in a stanza (*Puṟam.*, S. 367) which has a definite chronological value. She blesses therein the kings who attended that function and the editor adds the valuable note that Ukkira Peruvaḻudi, the conqueror of Kānappēreyil, and Chēramān Māri Vaṇkō, or Māri Veṇkō or Mā Vaṇkō were the royal guests on that occasion:

> "ஒன்றுபுரிந் தடங்கிய விருபிறப் பாளர்
> முத்தீப் புரையக் காண்டக விருந்த
> கொற்ற வெண்குடைக் கொடித்தேர் வேந்திர்
> யானறி யளவையோ விதுவே வானத்து
> வயங்கித் தோன்று மீனினு மிம்மென
> வியங்கு மாமழை யுறையினு
> முயர்த்துமேந் தோன்றிப் பொலிகநுந் நாளே."

The above are the closing lines of her benediction. The synchronism conveyed by this poem is strengthened by the references of the other poets too. As there is little to add about this royal celebrant of the Yāga, I shall pass on to the Pāṇḍiya line.

The Pandiya line:
(1) Musiri Murriya Celiyan.
(2) Ukkira-Peruvaludi, the conqueror of Kanappereyil.

52. Two Pāṇḍiya kings appear again in this generation. Their relationship with the Pāṇḍiyans of the previous generation is nowhere stated. So many as five poets sing of them; but absolutely little of any genealogical value could be gathered from any of their verses. The Pāṇḍiya king who tops the column appears to have laid seige to Musiṟi of the Chēras and won the praises of two poets, *viz.*, Tāyan Kaṇṇanār of Erukkāḍu and Nakkīrar. Both these poets belong to the previous generation too. This circumstance would require this king being taken to the preceding generation. But

certain other reasons have guided me to the present arrangement. First, the suggested disposition would bring about an unnecessary overcrowding of personages in one generation. Secondly, the name 'Ceḻiyan', however generic it might look, may still be supposed to have a specific relation with 'Neḍuñceḻiyan' which seems to alternate in the Pāṇḍiya line till this point in the Tables. And thirdly, the poets Nakkīrar and Tāyan Kaṇṇanār, though appearing in the eighth generation, should be assumed to have lived as well into the ninth. As a matter of fact Nakkīrar's name stands coupled with that of another king Chēramān Kō Kōdai Mārpan who distinctly belongs to the ninth generation only. Taking all these into account I deemed it not only expedient but proper to keep the 'besieger of Musiṟi' to the ninth generation. I have not found anything to enable me to identify him with any other Pāṇḍiyan in the line. I considered it safer, therefore, to give his name a separate entry till further light is thrown on him by future research.

Ukkira Peruvaḻudi,[1] an accomplished poet himself (*vide* his poem, stanza 26 in *Agaṉāṉūṟu*), receives the poetic tribute of Mūlam-kiḻār of Aiyūr (in *Puṟam.*, S. 21) and Katuvan Iḷa Maḷḷanār (in *Naṟṟiṇai*, S. 150). His relentless war against Vēṅkai Mārpan, the chieftain of Kānappēreyil, and his reduction of that fortress have received the high praises of the poets. If this king had any hand in the organisation of a Sangam or in patronising any of the collections of the Sangam works, the contemporary poets would have been the first to sing his praises for such an honour conferred on letters. Their testimony, on the other hand, is sadly lacking and hence the Sangam hypothesis should stand unsupported by contemporary evidence.

(1) Of the kings who appear in the Synchronistic Tables, this is the only ruler whose name appears in the Sanskrit garb. Very likely it may be a translation, done at the time of the redaction of the poems, of the Tamil appellative Kāy Cina Vaḻudi (காய்சின வழுதி) which happens to figure also in the Sangam legend.

The Chera line: (1) Cheraman Mari-Vanko. (2) Cheraman Ko-Kodai-Marpan.

53. It has been already remarked that the Chēra king Mā-Veṇkō or Māri-Vaṇkō was one of the royal guests on the occasion of the Rājasūya sacrifice of Perunaṟ-kiḷḷi. The name of this king is still involved in hopeless obscurity. It only shows the imperfections of the manuscripts which have transmitted it in all its variant forms. Another Chēra king by name Kō-Kōdai-Mārpan is referred to by Nakkīrar in *Agam.*, S. 346, and by Poigaiyār in *Puṟam.*, Ss. 48 and 49. These two names may refer to the same king; but there is nothing to confirm such an identification. I have, therefore, allowed the names to stand separately for the time being. It is curious to note that Nakkīrar in stanza (*Agam.*, S. 346) has taken the trouble to record the glee of Kō-Kōdai-Mārpan over a victory of Paḻaiyan Māṟan against one Kiḷḷi-Vaḷavan but has not given us an idea of anything else regarding that king.

The Chieftains.

54. Quite a large number of chieftains fill this generation. Vēnkai-Mārpan of Kānappēreyil, the opponent of Ukkira-Peruvaḻudi, and Adiyamān Neḍumān Añci, the great chieftain and patron of Avvaiyār, belong to this period.[1] From Añci, Avvaiyār is said to

(1) I have to raise an important point of interpretation as regards a particular reference to Paraṇar—decidedly not a contemporary of Avvaiyār—in one of Avvaiyār's stanzas composed to celebrate Añci's conquest of Kōvalūr. In *Puṟam.*, S. 99, the following lines occur:

" செருவேட்
டிமிழ் குரன் முரசி னெழுவரொடு முரணிச்
சென்றமர் கடந்துநின் னாற்ற றோற்றிய
வன்றும் பாடுநர்க் கரியை யின்றும்
பரணன் பாடினன் மற்கொன் மற்றுநீ
முரண்மிகு கோவலூர் நூறிநின்
னரணடு திகிரி யேந்திய தோளே."

The commentator of *Puṟanāṉūṟu* in explaining the passage says that Avvaiyār actually refers to Añci as having been sung by poet Paraṇar on the Kōvalūr victory. This is no doubt entirely wrong. The commentator has mistaken

have undertaken a sort of political mission to another ruler whom the editorial note identifies as Toṇḍaimān. The occasion of a visit to Toṇḍaimān's armoury was taken advantage of by Avvaiyār to compose a stanza in praise of the war-like qualities of her own chief Añci. We should note that the name Toṇḍaimān[2] does not appear for a ruler in any of the basic works, though the tribal name Toṇḍaiyar occurs. It may have come into use a little later. Peruñ-

an interrogative sentence for an assertive one and has accordingly missed to bring out the negative force of Avvaiyār's question. Following the lead of later grammarians, he takes மன் in the phrase மற்கொல் as an expletive and கொல் as expressing doubt. In early usage, மன் imported certainty and கொல் served merely as a question-mark. Whether கொல் actually implied doubt or a positive state of the questioner's mind could be settled only from the particular context in which the question occurs. Here the poetess clearly wants to convey a negation by her interrogatory. Her statement stands thus: "Even now, did Paraṇar (one of the greatest poets of by-gone days) certainly sing of your great victory?" The implication is: 'No, he did not sing for he is not now living; but lesser poets like ourselves have sung about you as best as we can, though we can hardly do justice to the greatness of your achievement'. Only such an interpretation as this will rationalise the statement in this stanza. If not, we shall have to hold Avvaiyār and Añci of the ninth generation contemporaries of Paraṇar who lived somewhere between the fourth and the fifth generation. One full century separates them according to these Tables and it would be absurd to try to throw these personages together on the strength of a misinterpretation of a literary text. For a fuller discussion of the use and exact meaning of the particles மன் and கொல் *vide* Appendix VIII: The Grammarians on the Significance of the Particles மன் and கொல்.

(2) As I have elsewhere pointed out about certain tribal names, the name Toṇḍaimān too appears in a contracted form. The fuller name is Toṇḍaiyarmagan, *i.e.*, one who belongs to the tribe of the Toṇḍaiyār. It was extended to denote the ruler also. The derivation of tribal names from those of individuals is a favourite method with some writers and all that I can say is that it is utterly against the facts of the history of early communities. It took long for individuals to emerge as independent entities from the early tribal or family organisations in which they had existed at the beginning. That truth is enforced by the history of all ancient societies. In utter forgetfulness of this important truth some writers try to trace the name 'Toṇḍaimān' to one Adoṇḍai Cakravarti, as if the Toṇḍaiyar tribes did not exist before the birth of that individual whose historicity remains still to be established! Toṇḍaimān was earlier known also as Tiraiyan (*vide* Nakkīrar in *Agam.*, S. 340, and Kāttūr Kiḻār's son Kaṇṇanār in *Agam.*, S. 85). Whether this Toṇḍaimān could be identified with another Toṇḍaimān Iḷantiraiyan appearing in the next generation should for the present be left unsettled.

cittiranār (*Puram.*, S. 208) and probably also Nāgaiyār, daughter of Añcil Āntai (*Agam.*, S. 352) sing of Adiyamān Añci. Kandan, who was generally known as Nāñcil Vaḷḷuvan, the chieftain of Nāñcilnāḍu, receives the mention of four poets, Marudan Iḷanāganār, Avvaiyār, Orucirai Periyanār and Kanda-Piḷḷai or Kadappiḷḷai of Karuvūr. This poet may be the son of Kanda-Piḷḷai Cāttanār, a poet of the previous generation. Kumanan of Mudira Malai, and Iḷaṅ-Kumaṇan, Veḷimān and Iḷa-Veḷimān and Periyan of Poraiyāṟu, Iḷaṅ-Kaṇḍīrakkō and Iḷa-Viccikkō crowd into this generation. Most of them were sung by Peruñcittiranār and Peruntalai Cāttanār. The latter poet was the son of Āvūr Mūlam Kiḻār of the previous generation and forms an important linear-link. As I have remarked already, these chieftains must remain, for the present, more as literary characters than historical.

Link-names.

The lateral links for this generation are furnished by Avvaiyār, Aiyūr Mūlam Kiḻār, Ulōccanār and Peruñcittiranār and the linear connection with the next generation is brought about by Avvaiyār, Poigaiyār, and Peruntalai Cāttanār. We shall now pass on to the tenth and last generation in the Tables.

THE TENTH GENERATION.

Cholan Ko-Cenkannan Period.

The Chola line: Ko-Cenkannan.

55. The Chōḻa king of this generation is found to be Kō-Ceṅkaṇṇan, "the red-eyed Chōḻa", according to the translators of his name. He stands connected with the previous generation by poet Poigaiyār. This poet, tradition assures us, composed a poetical work called *Kaḷavaḻi Nāṟpatu*, celebrating the victories of this war-like hero and at the same time procuring from him the release of the Chēra king, Chēramān Kaṇaikkāl-Irumporai. The prefatory note appended to stanza 74 of *Puṟanāṉūṟu* by its old commentator does not, however, tally with this tradition. The note gives us the additional information

that the battle between Kō-Ceṅkaṇṇan and the Chēra king Kaṇaikkāl-Irumporai took place in Tiruppōr, probably Pōr before referred to, that the Chēra king was taken prisoner and incarcerated at the fortress of Kuḍavāyil-kōṭṭam and that he chose to die there rather than face the misery and humiliation of an imprisoned life. Between a vague tradition and a literary text I would prefer the latter for authenticity in details. The weakness of traditions, as a class, lies in their details. How these vary, from time to time and from mouth to mouth, it is not necessary to relate. So, I think we may safely follow the version of the story as transmitted to us by the commentator of *Puranānūru* and hold that Kaṇaikkāl Irumporai had to meet with his sad end in his captive condition. Whether *Kaḷavaḻi Nārpatu* did actually lead to the liberation of the Chēra king or not, the synchronism implied in the tradition and openly stated in the note may well be accepted as historical truth.

Kaliṅgattupparaṇi, a later work, in its poetic account of the ancient Chōḻa kings, stops with this king, Kō-Ceṅkaṇṇan and we too have to stop with him for the present. It will be within the knowledge of our readers that this last Chōḻa appears in the works of a later period and plays the part of a great Śaiva devotee and a grand builder of fanes to Śiva. Many myths gather round his name for which readers may be referred to *Periyapurāṇam.*

56. I have to leave the Pāṇḍiya line blank for this generation. It is not on account of want of rulers in that dynasty but for want of guidance from link-names. Poets like Cīttalai Cāttanār and Pēreyil Muruvalār sing of certain Pāṇḍiya kings; but I cannot make use of them for the simple reason that none of these shows any relationship with any one in the Tables. There is further the Kō-Peruñchōḻan—Arivuḍai-Nambi Synchronism which too stands apart and defies rational inclusion in these Tables. Realising to the

The Pandiya line.

full how the value of the Tables would be affected by the introduction of doubtful names I have refrained from filling up the blank of the Pāṇḍiya line in this generation. Future research, let us hope, will open the way to solve the present difficulty. For this, if for no other reason, the existence of the difficulty should be definitely acknowledged and not glossed over.

The Chera line: Kanaikkal-Irumporai.

57. Though the fates have not been kind to the Chēra king Kanaikkāl-Irumporai, his character, spirit, and high sense of honour stand ennobled by a single poem of his included in the *Puṟanāṉūṟu* collection. Rather than leading an abject inglorious life in captivity, he seems to have embraced death by starvation —the earliest instance of non-violent non-co-operation we find recorded in Tamil literature. Poet Poigaiyār alludes to him in *Naṟṟiṇai,* stanza 18. Judging from the surrounding circumstances the great Chēra family of kings appears to have gone under an eclipse in this generation and the thread of their story too seems to break just here. And in another two centuries this ancient family became thoroughly dismembered.[1]

The Chiefs.

58. Only two chieftains deserve mention, *viz.*, Eḻini IV or Adiyamān Pokuṭṭeḻini, the son of Adiyamān Neḍumān Añci of the previous generation and another, by name Mūvan. Poet Peruntalai Cāttaṉār in *Puram.*, S. 209, administers a gentle rebuke to this latter chieftain for having put off giving the presents due to him. Mūvan by a strange fatality had also to undergo a singular though painful experience. Kaṇaikkāl-Irumporai, the Chēra king, seems to have fought and humbled him and even went to the extent of extracting his teeth, carrying them to his capital Toṇḍi and displaying them on his gates as a trophy of his victory. This barbarous act must undoubtedly have been done under some strong provocation of which noth-

(1) *Vide* Sir Walter Elliot's *Coins of Southern India,* p. 61.

ing, however, is stated in the poem. Poet Māmūlanār in *Agam.*, S. 211, alludes to a much earlier chief Matti of Kaḻār of the second generation in the Tables performing the same operation upon an enemy of his, Eḻini I. Perhaps the conditions of that early time were so primitive as to permit some to indulge in such personal violence and favour others to belaud it as a mark of heroism in the assailant!

One Toṇḍaimān Iḷantiraiyan appears here as the ruler of Vēṅkaḍam. He was sung by Poigaiyār and also is the hero of a long poem *Perumpāṇāṟṟuppaḍai* by poēt Kadiyalūr Rudran Kaṇṇan II. This poet may be a descendant of Rudran-Kaṇṇan I of the period of Karikālan the Great. As already stated the question arises whether this Iḷantiraiyan was the same individual as the one whom Avvaiyār met in a political mission from Añci. The probabilities are against such an identification.

Retrospect and Summary.

59. The continuation of the Tables beyond the tenth generation becomes impossible for the present by the absence of link-names to guide us. In the Pāṇḍiya line nine kings have come into the Tables. Three Pāṇḍiya rulers, Cittiraimāḍattu-tuñciya-Nanmāṟan, Aṟivuḍai-Nambi, and Āriyappaḍai - Kaḍanta - Neḍuñceḻiyan stand out. In the Chōḻa line, thirteen kings have been brought into the Tables leaving only two rulers Nalluruttiran and Kō-Peruñchōḻan for future inclusion, if possible. And in the Chēra line sixteen Chēra kings find a place in the Tables while only four, Kōṭṭampalattu-tuñciya-Chēramān, Ātan-Avini, Chēramān Pālai-Pāḍiya-Peruṅkaḍuṅkō, and Chēramān Vañcan are left out. Thus, on the whole, the Tables have synchronised about thirty-eight sovereigns of the three dynasties put together as against nine rulers in all yet remaining for synchronisation. Evidently these were all later kings. There need hardly be any doubt that some at least of them might transcend the period covered by the Tables and go in-

to any higher antiquity. The very nature and conditions of the earliest rulers in each dynasty do not at all permit any such arrangement. As for interposing any of them into the body of the Tables themselves, that too stands ruled out. The chronological frame-work is so interconnected and close-knit that there is hardly any room for filling in. These difficulties then only make it too clear where to look for in locating the remaining kings relatively to these Tables.

PART III.

CHRONOLOGY.

THE PROBABLE DATE OF THE TEN GENERATIONS.

Preliminary.

60. Let us take stock of what has been primarily accomplished in the foregoing Tables. A goodly number of the personages and events of ancient Tamil history that have till now been hanging together as a close-packed cluster in the distant perspective of time have been hereby separated and distributed in a chronological frame-work importing their natural order of co-existence and succession and extending over a period of about two centuries and a half. Dr. Vincent Smith wrote: "A sound frame-work of dynastic annals must be provided before the story of Indian religion, literature and art can be told aright." In the application of that dictum to South India, these Tables form the first serious attempt to present such a 'sound frame-work of dynastic annals'. It is not too sweeping to say that previous efforts in this field have one and all lacked this initial and absolutely necessary chronological scheme. Till now one would find it extremely difficult to assert with confidence whether a particular king or poet was or was not the contemporary, predecessor or successor of another king or poet. But the Tables here presented should enable him now to give a tolerably definite and correct answer on the point, at least for the earliest period in Tamil literature.

Relative Chronology of the Generations inter se.

61. The Ten Generations of kings, chieftains and poets brought into the Tables stand so interconnected that, in the first place, their *relative chronology* at least is

hereby absolutely fixed. To whatever period of time in the world-history these generations may be shifted, they have to be shifted as a whole and not in parts. Thus these Tables, even if they serve no other purpose, have at least irreversibly fixed the relationship of anteriority and posteriority among the various individuals and generations appearing in them. By no effort, for instance, can one take Nakkīrar and Avvaiyār to the generations of Paraṇar and Kapilar; nor can this latter couple be made to share the company of Sāttantaiyār and Nakkaṇṇaiyār. Even supposing that the Synchronistic Tables did not help us in the least in fixing the absolute period of time to which their system as a whole should be assigned, their guidance in respect of the relative chronology of some characters and events in Tamil history has a value all their own which can hardly be underrated, especially in view of the chaos in which all their facts stand plunged to this day. No doubt, the main purpose of this essay is to go into the far more important problem of settling the absolute chronology of these Ten Generations and seek a satisfactory solution as far as the available positive evidences would allow. Be the result of that attempt what it may, the compelling character of the testimony of the Tables in the more modest field of relative chronology cannot in the least be doubted.

The Absolute Chronology of the Generations.

62. In passing on to the question of locating these generations in some definite period in the past, we pass at once into the precincts of a most contested field. I do not want to pass in review the attempts that have been made till now to settle the chronology of the "Sangam" works and hence of these generations, for it would take me a good deal off the constructive line of inquiry I have proposed for this paper. I may, however, here mention that most of the previous writers have utilized the Ceṅkuṭṭuvan-Gajabāhu Synchronism as the corner stone of their chronological structure. Their conclusions

can hardly lay claim to any higher validity than what could reasonably be attached to the statements of two such works as *Cilappadikāram* and *Mahāvamso.* How historical facts may be twisted and torn out of their setting under artistic and religious motives and impulses which inspire and dominate the two aforementioned works need not be dwelt upon just now. Western scholars have hence shown a justifiable hesitation in accepting the uncorroborated testimony of these works, which are moreover admittedly very late productions for the period we are in quest of. The chronology of ancient Tamil literature should be raised on more solid foundations than such a double layer of quicksand as *Cilappadikāram* and *Mahāvamso.* Is there then a more promising line of approach to the whole question?

The Testimony of the early Greek and Roman writers.

63. Luckily for us the early Greek and Roman writers who have left a record of their observations of South India enable us to tackle this problem with some hope of success. Leaving aside the writers of the Pre-Christian centuries I shall confine my attention to the following three authors who appeared close to one another at the early centuries after Christ:—

The author of the *Periplus*	.. 70 A.D.
Pliny	.. 77 or 78 A.D.
Ptolemy	.. 140 A.D.

If Tamil chronology is raised on the testimony of such writers as these, the haziness and uncertainty which envelop it at present should vanish. Western scholars, who are disposed to look askance at the statements of *Cilappadikāram* and *Mahāvamso,* could, on no account, be tempted to question the veracity of the witnesses who have been here cited for examination. The evidence of such writers, if any, should carry conviction and compel a verdict for its sound historicity. It is true that many scholars have before this handled the works of these early authors and drawn therefrom much valuable information

regarding the commercial, social, and political conditions of ancient Tamiḻagam. But none of them, as far as I can remember, has utilized his information for a definite fixation of Tamil chronology; and this, I think, was more or less due to an omission on their part to bring the relevant facts contained in early Tamil literature and those in the works of the European writers into a proximity for comparison and to make therefrom the necessary deductions. To me a careful reading of these Greek and Roman authors has disclosed an unmistakable clue for the fixation of Tamil chronology on a definite and satisfactory basis. And it is the conquest of the Āayi country by Pasumpūṇ-Pāṇḍiyan or Neḍuñceḻiyan II of the Tables. The author of the *Periplus* is definite in his reference to Travancore, south of Nelcynda, as the Pāṇḍiya country, with its capital 'Modoura' situated far inland from the coast. This was about 70 A.D. Ptolemy, who gives his account about 70 years later, *i.e.*, about 140 A.D., refers to the same part of the country as the 'Aioi country'. Both these facts open a new line of approach to settle the vexed question of Tamil chronology.

The reference in the *Periplus* is plainly inapplicable to the period preceding Pasumpūṇ-Pāṇḍiyan's time. Neither Ollaiyūr-tanta-Pūtappāṇḍiyan, nor his predecessor, the Pāṇḍiyan of Koṟkai, known as Neḍuñceḻiyan I, had conquered the kingdom of the Āayi family of rulers. Ollaiyūr-tanta-Pūtappāṇḍiyan's reference to Āayi Titiyan of Pothiyil as "Pothiyil Selvan", the prosperous lord of Pothiyil, shows, as has already been pointed out, that the kings of Pothiyil were independent rulers at that period. Much less is there any possibility of ascribing the victory against the Āayi king to his predecessor, the Pāṇḍiya king of Koṟkai, who could accomplish only the conquest of Kūḍal and establish the Pāṇḍiya power there with a very limited dominion in the vicinity of that city. Thus then we may safely conclude that, by the time of the *Periplus, i.e.*, 70 A.D., Pasum-

pūṇ-Pāṇḍiyan had effected the conquest of the Āayi country. It is natural, therefore, to expect that the Āayi country, having gone under the power of the Pāṇḍiyans, should be known as the Pāṇḍiya country ever after that conquest or if that period is uncertain, ever after 70 A.D. But what do we find in Ptolemy, who comes about 140 A.D.? He calls middle and south Travancore the Āayi country. If this were taken as applying to the time of the independent line of the Āayi rulers, as Āayi Aṇḍiran, Āayi Titiyan and Āayi Atiyan, who appear in the third, the fourth and the fifth generation respectively in the Tables, the reference in the *Periplus* should be taken as applying to a period three generations still earlier than these. The testimony of ancient Tamil literature does not, however, favour such a supposition. Still, the significance of Ptolemy's reference could be brought out in full only if we kept it nearer the period of the Āayi's of early Tamil literature as much as possible. The more and more we move down the centuries, the less and less are the chances of Ptolemy's reference becoming applicable to this fact of ancient Tamil history. The connection of the name of the Āayi kings with the country ruled over by them should naturally be expected to disappear as we descend from the classical period to modern times.

The reign of Pasumpūṇ-Pāṇḍiyan gives us then the upper limit beyond which the reference in the *Periplus* cannot be taken. Even supposing that the author of the *Periplus* pens his account immediately after Pasumpūṇ-Pāṇḍiyan's victory, *i.e.*, fixing *Periplus* to the fifth generation, we shall then have to place Ptolemy's account somewhere about the eighth generation, Kuḷamuṟṟattu-tuñciya-Kiḷḷi-Vaḷavan period. Though we are perfectly free to bring down the reference of the *Periplus* to still later generations, we are precluded from that course by the necessity of keeping Ptolemy's account to some period quite adjacent to Pasumpūṇ-Pāṇḍiyan's victory. Even after this conquest of the Āayi country, its original ruler

or his descendant could very well have been in possession of that territory as a vassal of the Pāṇḍiya king. And, as a matter of fact, we find one Titiyan, most probably of Pothiyil (the Āayi country), joining a confederacy of certain rulers against Talaiyālaṅkānattu-Ceru-Venṟa Pāṇḍiyan and fighting with him for regaining his independence. Thus, it is but reasonable to suppose that, in the generation immediately succeeding that of the Talaiyālaṅkānam victor, the Āayi country would still have retained its original name and that Ptolemy did nothing else than recording the name that must have persisted in the mouth of the people, though in actual fact the country had passed under the Pāṇḍiya rule by that time. The value of this couple of references from the Greek writers arises from their joint application to a fact brought out in the Synchronistic Tables. Each reference, by itself, is incapable of giving us the necessary guidance. But when taken together and applied to the Tables, they acquire a distinct chronological value. Both the references should be kept very close to the period of Pasumpūṇ-Pāṇḍiyan's victory, in order that they might lose the edge of their seeming contradiction. Consequently, locating the account of the *Periplus* in the earliest generation in the Tables to which one can reasonably carry it, *i.e.*, the fifth generation or Uruva-pah-tēr-Ilañcēḍcenni period and marking it as covering 50 A.D. to 75 A.D., I have assigned the antecedent and subsequent generations to dates calculated from the above and embodied the results in a tabular statement given in the next page.

DATES OF THE GENERATIONS.

Generation.	Names of the Chōḻa kings.	Approximate Date.
1st Generation ..	Tittan (*alias*) Veḷiyan Tittan Period ..	50 B.C.—25 B.C.
2nd Do. ..	Tittan Veḷiyan (*alias*) Pōrvaikkō-Perunaṟkiḷḷi Period ..	25 B.C.— 1 A.D.
3rd Do. ..	Muḍittalaikkō Perunaṟkiḷḷi Period ..	1 A.D.—25 A.D.
4th Do. ..	Vēḷ-pah-taḍakkai-Perunnaṟkiḷḷi Period ..	25 A.D.—50 A.D.
5th Do. ..	Uruva-pah-tēr-Iḷañcēḍcenni Period .. (*Pasumpūṉ-Pāṇḍiyan's victory against the Āayi king and the Periplus' Reference come during this Period.*)	50 A.D.—75 A.D.
6th Do. ..	Karikālan the Great or Karikālan II's Period ..	75 A.D.—100 A.D.
7th Do. ..	Chēḍcenni Nalaṅkiḷḷi Period ..	100 A.D.—125 A.D.
8th Do. ..	Kuḷamuṟṟattu-tuñciya-Kiḷḷi-Vaḻavan Period .. (*Ptolemy's reference falls within this period.*)	125 A.D.—150 A.D.
9th Do. ..	Rājasūyam Vēṭṭa Perunaṟkiḷḷi Period ..	150 A.D.—175 A.D.
10th Do. ..	Kō-Ceṅkaṇṇan Period ..	175 A.D.—200 A.D.

The distribution of the Ten Generations for the most part to the first two centuries of the Christian era is necessary not only because the two references from the western writers fit in with the facts of that specific period but are also incapable of being brought into relation with those of any other century preceding or succeeding it. After the victory of the Talaiyālaṅkānam battle, wherein Titiyan, in all probability Āayi Titiyan II of Pothiyil, had fought by the side of the confederates to regain his independence, the Pothiyil kingdom appears to have been broken up into petty chieftaincies and bestowed on the vassals of the Pāṇḍiya overlord. Neḍuñceḻiyan III must have realised the danger of allowing an extensive kingdom like Pothiyil to be in charge of a single vassal, however devoted he might be for the time being to his sovereign. The vassal might at any time throw up his allegiance and defy the paramount power. So, Neḍuñceḻiyan III, a far-sighted statesman that he was, must have parcelled out the Pothiyil kingdom amongst a number of chieftains and effectively prevented any future rebellion. Vāṭṭāṟu and Nāñcilnāḍu were portions of this kingdom bestowed on Eḻini Ātan and one Vaḷḷuvan Kandan and these chiefs appear in the generations immediately following the Talaiyālaṅkānam battle. The dismemberment of the Āayi kingdom thus carried out would certainly render Ptolemy's reference inapplicable to any century much subsequent to that memorable fight.

The Aayi Kings and their kingdom.

64. Some may be inclined to view Ptolemy's reference to the Āayi country as merely casual and hold that that simple fact can scarcely be made to support the vast superstructure of Tamil chronology. So completely have the Āayi kings vanished out of later Tamil history and, so insignificant a part do they play even in the earlier, that such doubts are quite possible and even natural. But a careful reading of the early Tamil works and a just appreciation of the political conditions they disclose will establish

beyond any reasonable doubt that the Āayis were an illustrious and powerful line of rulers of that period and that Ptolemy's reference to them was anything but accidental. In approaching this early period we have to give up all our later-day notions regarding the grandeur of the three Tamil monarchies, which, by subsequent historical vicissitudes, happened to fill the stage of politics in South India to the exclusion of the other powers. We have to revise thoroughly our political conceptions imbibed from modern Tamil literature and adjust our vision to other luminaries in the political firmament of ancient Tamiḻagam. Then, we shall find, instead of three, five major powers exercising sway over the southern half of Peninsular India in those days. My authority for this statement is contained in two of Asoka's Edicts—Rock Edicts, Nos. II and XIII—which enumerate the border states of the south, lying beyond Siddhāpur, in the Chitaldrug District of Mysore, the southernmost limit of the Mauryan empire at that time.[1] The Shahbazgarhi version of Edict XIII definitely mentions one Hiḍa Rāja. It is significant to note that all the powers except Hiḍa Rāja have been given communal names, without the mention of the name of any individual king of those communities. The name 'Satiyaputra', evidently a later Sanskritised formation from 'Satti Makkaḷ' or 'Satti

(1) Asōka's Rock Edict II (The Shahbazgarhi version):—

"Everywhere in the Empire of king Priyadarsin, beloved of the Gods, as well as among those nations and princes such as the Chodas, the Paindiyas the Satiyaputra, the Keralaputra, Tambapanni, the Yona king, etc."—

—*Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. II, p. 466.

Rock Edict XIII (The Shahbazgarhi version):—

".......and he called Alikasudra further in the South where the Chodas and Paindas dwell as far as Tambapanni likewise where the Hida King dwells."—*Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. II, p. 471.

The Girnār and Mansehra versions are in a mutilated condition; the Kalsi version has 'Hidalaja' ('l' being used for 'r'). The name 'Yona' of Edict II is evidently a mislection for 'Hida' of Edict XIII. Between Tambapanni and the Tamil States, it is impossible to interpolate a 'Yona King'. There is no doubt that the Hiḍa Rāja herein referred to was one of the remote ancestors of the Āayi kings of Tamil literature.

Mākkaḷ', stands for a mixed tribe (a northern people mixing with the forest tribes on the northern confines of the Koṅgu country) which was occupying Koṅgu and Koṇkānam, adjoining the Ēḻilmalai range, north of the Coimbatore gap. The Ghat to the south of this Pass was known as the Pothiyil mountain and it was in the possession of 'Hiḍa' Rāja, the king of the shepherds or neatherds, the ancestor of the Āayi kings who figure in the Tables. Besides these two mountain or forest kings the three Tamil agricultural communities find mention in the Mauryan inscriptions. Any detailed treatment of the political constitution of these communities is foreign to this paper and cannot be undertaken at present. What is significant for us to note in Asōka's inscriptions is the specific mention of Hiḍa Rāja. The name 'Hiḍa', which to this day stands unidentified, is a northern aspirated variant of the Tamil name 'Iḍa', 'Iḍaya', 'Iḍayar', a synonym of Āayar, which appears in the singular form as 'Āayi'. Thus we see the antiquity of the Āayi kings, who are mentioned in the early Tamil literature, mounts up to 250 B.C., and possibly still earlier. And their importance too is vouched for by the honour of a separate mention in Asōka's enumeration of the South Indian rulers. In the face of this valuable record of ancient history, the attempt to belittle the significance of Ptolemy's reference to the Āayi country is altogether misdirected and also ill-informed. The story of the Āayi kings belongs to one of the earliest chapters in Tamil history, which remains yet to be written. The glories of their rule, and even the fact of their having ever existed, have been buried deep under the ruins of ancient monarchies which fell to pieces before the destructive wars of the Tamil triumvirs. Research has to patiently dig beneath the later accumulations for the scattered facts which might enable it to piece together in a manner the history of this lost line of rulers. In these circumstances, any failure to attach due weight to Ptolemy's reference would only prove our

inability to appreciate the political conditions of ancient Tamiḻagam, all on account of the prepossessions engendered in us by later literature, or rather by a peculiar interpretation of that literature by uncritical and historically-obtuse commentators.

The Conquest of the Aayi country.

65. As already stated, three Āayi kings meet us in the early Tamil poems, *viz.*, Āayi Aṇḍiran, Āayi Titiyan and Āayi Atiyan, who were independent sovereigns of Pothiyil. Another Āayi also, Eyinan, appears in the second generation; but he was a commander of the Chōḷa forces and may probably have been a member of a branch of that ancient family. It was in the time of the third ruler Āayi Atiyan[1] that the Pothiyil dominion was invaded by Pasumpūṇ-Pāṇḍiyan and annexed[2] to his Kūḍal kingdom. Ever after this, the Āayis seem to have sunk to the level of Pāṇḍiya feudatories and are little heard of. No doubt, the family must have persisted to much later times as we meet with one Karuṇandaḍakkan, probably an Āayi of the 9th century mentioned in the *Travancore Archæological Series*. But the line never seems to have regained the independent position it had lost by the Pāṇḍiya incursion.

Certain Considerations re this Chronology.

66. Though the fixation of time I have attempted in this paper proceeds on the identification of an historical fact, still it may be urged that there is some arbitrariness in making the date of the *Periplus*, *i.e.*, 70 A.D., fall within the generation of Pasumpūṇ-

(1) That Atiyan and Atiyamān belonged to the shepherd or cowherd family of kings is verified by the following entry in p. 141 of Duff's *Chronology of India*: "Vishnu Vardhana was aided in his conquests by Gangaraja of the Ganga family who, by conquering and putting to flight Adiyama or Idiyama, a feudatory of the Chōḷa, acquired the Gangavadi province." Here "Adiyama" and "Idiyama" evidently stand for Atiyamān or Atiyarmagan and Iḍayamān or Iḍayarmagan respectively. This usage of the 12th century throws additional light on the earlier use of the name 'Hida Raja' in the Rock Edict XIII of Asōka.

(2) *Vide* Appendix IX: Note on the Elephant-marked Coins of Madura, for the numismatic evidence bearing on this question.

Pāṇḍiyan. Although the reference in the *Periplus* cannot be taken to generations earlier than Pasumpūṇ-Pāṇḍiyan's, there is no reason why it could not be moved still lower down. True, it could be moved much lower down for many generations or even centuries; but such a procedure would necessitate taking Ptolemy's reference still further down and rendering it utterly inapplicable to the political conditions obtaining then. To be intelligible at all, Ptolemy's reference should be held to apply to a condition of affairs immediately following Pasumpūṇ-Pāṇḍiyan's victory. This at least will not brook any indefinite shifting as the reference contained in the *Periplus*. Realising that the memory of the Āayi family of rulers and their country would have persisted for two or three generations even after the Pāṇḍiyan's conquest of the Pothiyil country, I have located Ptolemy in the 8th generation in the Tables. Although absolute precision has not been obtained in the fixation of time, proceeding as it does on such considerations, the error, if any there be, would scarcely be more than a generation or two at the highest. Allowing for that margin of error, we can safely assert that the lower end of the Tables will hardly admit of being shifted below 250 A.D. That must be the utmost lower limit beyond which the Ten Generations cannot be taken. By this arrangement a full century would intervene between Talaiyālaṅkāṇattu Pāṇḍiyan's time and Ptolemy and a century and three-fourths between Pasumpūṇ-Pāṇḍiyan and Ptolemy. Surely, it is almost impossible that a people would cherish the memory of the Āayi kings for more than a century from the final smashing of that power in the Talaiyālaṅkāṇam battle and the sundering of its dominions into many petty chieftaincies. Even under this readjusted arrangement, where the utmost allowance has been made for any possible error, the ten generations would stand distributed between 1 A.D. and 250 A.D. This, however, only establishes the value of the standard herein adopted for the determination of time

and its, resistance to any very great variation. Though it has not given us the absolute period, it has placed within our reach the very nearest approximation to it.

Confirmatory Evidence.

67. It behoves us then to explore the writings of these early foreign authors a little more closely and ascertain whether they contain facts which will fortify the conclusion above set forth.

(a) Political.

As the Synchronistic Tables comprise exactly the period when the three Tamil monarchies entered on a war-path for the extension of their dominions, the political picture presented by the Greek writers will doubtless be invaluable as affording important independent evidence on the matter. The *Periplus* gives Naura and Tyndis as the first ports of Damirica. Schoff identifies Naura with Cannanore, probably because Dr. Vincent Smith fixed Chandragiri River as the northernmost limit of Damirica. We have already referred to Yule's identification of this place (*vide* p. 137) as Mangalore, a coast town in the South Canara District, north of the river Chandragiri. According to this latter identification, and assuming that the city Naṟavu (நறவு) mentioned in *Patiṟṟuppattu* (85) "குடா நறவின் நாண்மகிழிருக்கை" refers to the same, one can easily see that the Chēra dominions had extended up to that place by the time of the *Periplus*. From the Tables we see that the northern extension of the Chēra country along the coast began with Neḍuñchēralātan's time, *i.e.,* about 25 A.D. Within two generations from this period the Chēras had even penetrated the Tuḷu country to the north. Thus the reference of the *Periplus* would not be applicable to any generations anterior to these. Turning to Ptolemy we find him interposing the country of the 'Batois' between the Pāṇḍiyan territory and the Chōḻa kingdom. These 'Batois' were the forest tribes, who still resisted the Tamil kings. The Ēḻeyil (or Seven Forts) overthrown by the Chōḻa king Nalaṅkiḷḷi and the Kānappēreyil subdued by Ukkirapperuvaḻudi refer to the fort-

resses in the occupation of the Nāga tribes of that time. Within two or three generations from Nalaṅkiḷḷi's period these forest chiefs should have been politically swept out of existence. Accordingly, the reference by Ptolemy will not hold good for generations later than Ukkiraperuvaḻudi's. Take again Ptolemy's description of the Chōḻa country. He refers to the 'Paralia of the Soretai' as a political division. 'Paralia' was the coast country of the Chōḻas then known as 'Neytalaṅkānal' (நெய்தலங்கானல்). After one or two generations from Nalaṅkiḷḷi's period this political district, as a separate province, must have disappeared from the Chōḻa domains and must have been wholly incorporated in them. Ptolemy makes distinct mention of the territory of the 'Arouarnori' (Arvarnoi), *i.e.*, the Aruvāḷar tribes of the Arcot region. Though Karikālan the Great effected the final conquest and colonisation of this region, the Tamil race and the forest tribes could hardly be soon fused. They formed two distinct strata of the then existing society and Ptolemy's description exactly hits off that social condition. In the space of a few generations from that period, the distinctions would have disappeared and society would have presented a more homogeneous aspect. This also shows that Ptolemy's account would become quite inapplicable if we took it down to later generations. From this hasty retrospect of the political and social conditions we find that the references of these Greek writers give us an upper and a lower limit beyond which we cannot take the facts testified to by these early poems. Moreover, the Synchronistic Tables refer to the conquest of Karuvūr and of Kūḍal (Madura), and these should have been carried out even before the time of the *Periplus* and Pliny, *i.e.*, 70 to 77 A.D. Ptolemy's inclusion of 'Magour' and 'Karmara' among the inland cities of the 'Paralia of the Soretai' shows that before 140 A.D., these cities had been annexed to the Chōḻa territory. These cities which have probably since disappeared or have changed their names may be

identified with Mōgūr of Pa̲laiyan and Ka̲lumalam, conquered by Karikālan I[1] in the second and third generations as the Tables would show.

Let us consider another striking episode narrated in *Patirruppattu.* Neḍuñchēralātan is reported to have imprisoned a number of Yavanas and subjected them to peculiar indignities. Certainly that Chēra king did not sail all the way to Greece to achieve this victory. The reference of the *Periplus* to Byzanteion—a colony of the Byzantine Greeks said to have been in existence then on the West Coast—makes the account of the Tamil poet intelligible to us. After this signal defeat the colony appears to have dwindled down and gone out of existence. This has led many of the commentators of the *Periplus* to deny the existence of the Greek colony and question even the accuracy of the testimony of the *Periplus* on this point!

All these isolated political facts contained in the early European writers when brought into relation with those of the Tables raise chronological presumptions of a positive and definite value for our purpose.

(b) Geographical.

68. Turning to a comparison of the geographical facts of these writers and of the early Tamil documents we find that they exhibit a striking parallelism of great significance. In the almost general fury with which the older Tamil names of countries, cities, rivers, and mountains in the south have been ruthlessly replaced by names of Sanskrit origin, in later periods of Tamil history, the writings of these Greek authors seem to come from a different world and, what is more important and valuable for our purpose, tally exactly with the earlier works of Tamil literature in their

(1) The following lines of Poet Kuḍavāyil Kīrattanār refer to the conquest of Ka̲lumalam by Karikālan I:

" கணைய னகப்படக் கழுமலந் தந்த
பிணையலங் கண்ணிப் பெரும்பூட் சென்னி".

—*Agam.*, S. 44.

Karikālan I, otherwise known as Perumpūṇ Cenni, should certainly then precede Ptolemy.

geographical nomenclature.[1] On this point at least the Sangam works, on which the Tables are based, stand more closely related to the works of the European writers of the first and second centuries A.D., than to the Tamil works of the religious epoch. For instance, by the lapse of centuries these later works, though belonging to one and the same country as the early poems, are distinctly thrown into a separate stratum of literature altogether; but, on the other hand, the Greek writings we have here taken up for consideration and the basic works of the Tables, separated as they are by the *locale* and nationality of their authors, yet exhibit a similitude in their toponomy which strongly favours the presumption of their identical age. Sanskritists, who seem to be on familiar ground when identifying North Indian names, have felt themselves wholly at sea in the identification of the geographical names of ancient Tamiḻagam. Early Tamil literature, which alone contains the key of interpretation of ancient South Indian names, being a sealed book to them, they have been sometimes led into fantastic and even ludicrous errors of identification. The name 'Aioi' is derived from 'Ahi' the serpent, and 'Nelcynda' of the *Periplus,* according to Fabricius, is Nīlakanṭa! Homophony thus simplifies most of their identification of names in the Tamil country. Taking the name 'Ariaca' of the *Periplus* Mr. W. H. Schoff writes: "This word in the text is very

(1) How a systematic attempt at wholesale renaming was made, not by the people, of course, but by the *litterateurs*, could be seen from instances like the following which tell their own tale. 'Ārkkāḍu' becomes 'Ṣaḍāraṇyam'; 'Peṇṇaiyāṟu' turns into 'Pinākini'; 'Pālāṟu' is replaced by 'Chīrini'; 'Uṟaiyūr' takes on the pompous title 'Uragapuram'; 'Eḻilmalai' had to pass through the stages of two mistranslations, 'Sapta Sailam' and the 'Rat Mountain' springing from Mount D'Ely; 'Paramkunṟu' near Madura was ousted by 'Skanda Giri', which in the Muhammadan times had to struggle with 'Sikander Malai'. Such curiosities deserve a separate handling but what is worthy of remark in this connection is that, in course of time, the original Tamil names, which had to hide their diminished heads before their more dignified competitors, had also to allow these latter to leap over them in point of time. The ingrained tendency of some Sanskritists to trace Tamil names to Sanskrit originals has introduced the greatest confusion in the chronology of Early Tamil History.

uncertain. Lassen thinks that the name is properly the Sanskrit Latica (pronounced Larica) and included the land on both sides of the gulf of Cambay". Other derivations too have been suggested as Rāṣtrika and Aparāntika. If these writers had carefully noted the use of the same name by Ptolemy in the forms 'Ariake Sadinon' and 'Ariake of the Pirates',[1] they could easily have made out that it referred to the country later on known as the Mahārāshtra, then ruled over by the Sātakarni kings of the Āndhra dynasty. Ariaca stood for Ārya-agam, the country of the Aryans, as Damirica denoted Tamil̤-agam, the country of the Tamils. These were the names of the two divisions of Peninsular India at that time. To the Tamils of that early period 'Aryan'[2] was the name of the people who inhabited the northern part of the Peninsula immediately adjoining their own country. The phrase 'ஆரியர் வணக்கி' occurring in such works as *Patiṟṟuppattu* should be interpreted as the victory of certain Tamil kings won against the Aryan rulers of the early Āndhra dynasty in the south and not the Aryans at the Gangetic basin as the author of *Cilappadikāram* represented it later on. Dr. Burnell identified Cottanara of the *Periplus* as Kōlattunāḍu and Drs. Buchanan and Caldwell as Kaḍatta Nāḍu. Mr. K. P. P. Menon goes still further and creates one Koḍunāḍu. But ancient Tamil literature gives the exact equivalent of this name as Kuṭṭanāḍu[3] which

---

(1) These pirates were none other than the Kadamba tribes appearing in Tamil literature as the Kaḍambu against which the early Chēra kings had to wage war to put down their depredations. We understand that during Pliny's time there was piracy in the west coast; but by the time of Ptolemy it had been more or less suppressed. The credit of this achievement goes to the successors of the Chēra King Neḍuñchēralātan. His son and immediate successor, Kaḍal-piṟakkōṭṭiya-Vēl-Keḻu Kuṭṭuvan, *i.e.*, the Chēra king who defeated and drove back the sea-faring Kaḍambu tribes, began this warfare between 50 and 75 A.D., and by the time of Ptolemy, the Chēra power must have securely pushed its way into the South Canara District and so established itself there as to render any piratical pursuit impossible under its settled rule.

(2) *Vide* Appendix X: Note on the Āryas and 'Vaḍapulam'.

(3) Kuṭṭanāḍu was the earliest seat of the Government of the Chēra sovereigns, giving rise to the name 'Kuṭṭuvan' for that line of kings. From

still persists in popular usage in Central Travancore. Having identified the Pyrrhon of the *Periplus* as the "Red Bluffs" of Varkalai, it is surprising that Mr. W. H. Schoff should take the first place in Paralia, Balita, also as Varkalai. Balita is 'Veḷiyam', the older and non-nasalized form of Viḻiññam with the locative suffix *attu*[1] added to it. 'Veḷiyattu' occurring in the early Tamil poems has been changed into 'Balita'. Compare the line

"*வான வரம்பன் வெளியத் தன்னநடம்*"

—*Agam.*, S. 359.

This Veḷiyam becomes Viḻiññam later on and Ptolemy's 'Elangkon' is the same name with the initial weak medial letter 'v' dropped. Mr. Schoff identifies 'Sopatma' as Sū-patana (fair town) and opines that it must be Madras; while a student of Tamil would see in it Sō-paṭṭinam, a fortified town also known as Eyil-paṭṭinam, the sea-port of Nalliyakkōḍan. The 'Malanga' of Ptolemy is certainly the Māvilaṅkai of Tamil literature, at the mouth of the Pālār river, the seat of the Māmallapuram rock-cut temples of later days. Some scholars have shifted this site to the mouth of the river North Peṇṇār and Cunningham moves it still further north to the mouth of the Godavari! These mis-identifications, I am aware, do not at all reflect on the scholarship of the writers cited. But how can even these great scholars accomplish the impossible? The ancient Tamil names must remain a riddle to Sanskritists as is too well and too clearly established by their experiments in reading them for purposes of identification.

---

this original seat they seem to have moved north along the coast and east into Cochin and the Koṅgu country in a career of conquest.

(1) This is what Dr. Burnell writes in a like instance. "Hiouen-Thsang (iii., pp. 105-110) calls the small kingdom that he visited ''An-ta-lo' (Andhra) and the capital—'Ping-K'i-lo'. It appears to me that this is intended for Vengi; the 'lo' being merely the locative suffix—'lo' of the Telugu nouns, naturally mistaken by the worthy Chinese pilgrim monk for a part of the word. So the Portuguese called Calayam-Chaliatta, using the inflected form of the name.—*South Indian Palaeography*, foot-note in p. 16.

Even more than the parallelisms in the mention of place-names in the works we are just now comparing, the parallelisms in omission possess a decisive chronological value. The writings of the early Greeks and the 'Sangam' poems do not make mention of any such towns as Calicut, Cochin, Quilon, Trivandrum, Tinnevelly, Rameswaram, Tanjore, Chidambaram, and Conjeevaram, for the simple reason that they were all non-existent then. On the other hand, the great towns mentioned by both have now vanished out of existence: Toṇḍi, Karuvūr, Koṟkai, Kāvirippaṭṭinam, and Sōpaṭṭinam for instance. These two sets of facts prove that the writings we are now comparing belong to an identical age. If they do not establish an absolute synchronism, they must at least be taken as coming very close together.

Another significant fact also deserves mention here. Just as early Tamil Literature throws considerable light on some of the Greek writings of that period, these writings also serve to illuminate certain dark places in Tamil Literature. I have already referred to the early form of the name Uṟaiyūr as Uṟattūr of Ptolemy, which gives us the original of Urantai, appearing frequently in the early poems. I shall cull another bit of valuable information from Ptolemy and wind up my remarks under this head. Among the early Tamil poets the name of one Mācāttanār or Mācāttiyār of Okkūr occurs. The manuscripts contained two readings of the place-name as Okkūr and Ekkūr. The editor, as he had no other guidance in the matter, had to choose Okkūr (ஒக்கூர்) as the correct reading and inserted it in his text, relegating 'Ekkūr' to the unimportance of a foot-note. But we now understand that Ekkūr is the correct form, for 'Eikour' is found included among the inland cities of the 'Paralia of the Soretai' given by Ptolemy. Thus these two sets of writings are mutually helpful in illuminating certain dark corners in the history of ancient Tamiḻagam. It need not be imagined that in spite of this

helpfulness the writings might go into different centuries possibly adjacent to one another. If any slight anteriority could be claimed for any one set of these documents, it should be in favour of the Tamil works which form the basis of the Synchronistic Tables. These bring to light, in the clearest manner possible, the conquest of Uraiyūr, of Karuvūr and of Kūḍal, the three capital towns of the Tamil sovereigns, in three different generations. The writings of the author of the *Periplus,* and those of Pliny and Ptolemy give us a picture of the Tamil kingdoms as already possessing those capital cities and hence they conclusively establish that some at least of these poems go back to a period somewhat anterior to 70 A.D. In the face of evidence as incontrovertible as this, what value can we attach to the findings of those scholars who try to bring down the date of these poems to the 4th or the 5th or even the 7th or the 8th century A.D.?

69. Another line of confirmatory evidence may be drawn from the brisk trade that was going on between Tamilagam and Rome in the first two centuries of the Christian era. This commerce began on a considerable scale only after 45 A.D., the date when Hippalus made the important discovery that without facing the tediousness of a coasting voyage the Malabar coast could be reached in a short time by a direct sea-route with the help of the South-West Monsoon Wind. This foreign trade continued till the Alexandrian massacre perpetrated by Caracalla about 215 A.D. The hey-day of the Indian-Roman trade thus falls within the first two centuries of the Christian era. Both early European writers and early Tamil Literature testify to this unprecedented commercial intercourse. The pages of Pliny are filled with denunciations of the luxury and wasteful extravagance of the Romans of his day. "Luxury", he wrote, "arose at last to such a pitch that a chaplet was held in no esteem at all if it did not consist entirely of leaves sewn together with the needle. More recently

(c) Commercial.

again they have been imported from India, or from nations beyond the countries of India. But it is looked as the most refined of all, to present chaplets made of nard leaves, or else of silk of many colours steeped in unguents. Such is the pitch to which the luxuriousness of our women has at last arrived" (Pliny XXI. 8). Tacitus in his *Annals* reproduces a letter from the emperor, Tiberius, to the Roman Senate protesting against the mad extravagance. It runs: "If a reform is in truth intended, where must it begin? And how am I to restore the simplicity of ancient times?......How shall we reform the taste for dress? How are we to deal with the peculiar articles of feminine vanity, and in particular with that rage for jewels and precious trinkets, which drains the Empire of its wealth, and sends in exchange for the baubles, the money of the commonwealth to foreign nations, and even to the enemies of Rome?" (*Annals* iii, 53). In his edition of the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, Mr. W. H. Schoff writes thus of the pepper trade alone: "The trade in pepper in the time of the Roman Empire brought the merchants unheard-of profits just as it did later the Genoese and Venetians. It was one of the most important articles of commerce between India and Rome, supplying perhaps three-quarters of the total bulk of the average west-bound cargo". This picture of the west tallies exactly with that remarkable commercial activity in Tamilagam depicted for us in the early poems.

" * * சேரலர்
சுள்ளியம் பேரியாற்று வெண்ணுரை கலங்க
யவனர் தந்த வினைமா ணன்கலம்
பொன்னொடு வந்து கறியொடு பெயரும்
வளங்கெழு முசிறி"

—*Agam.*, *S.* 149.

" சினங்கெழு தானைத் தித்தன் வெளிய
னிரங்குநீர்ப் பரப்பிற் கானலம் பெருந்துறைத்
தனந்தரு நன்கலஞ் சிதையத் தாக்குஞ்
சிறுவெள் ளிறவின் குப்பை."

—*Agam.*, *S.* 152.

"இருங்கழிப் படப்பை மருங்கூர்ப் பட்டினத்
தெல்லுமி ழாவணத் தன்ன
கல்லென் கம்பலை."

—*Agam.*, *S.* 227.

These extracts from the primary poems unfold the commercial activity of ancient Tamiḻagam only incidentally.

The excerpts from *Pattuppāṭṭu* contain however a more detailed account. *Paṭṭinappālai,* one of the poems in that collection composed in honour of Karikālan the Great, contains a graphic picture and a few lines from it, just to give an idea, may be extracted here:

"வேலாழி வியன்றெருவி
னல்லிறைவன் பொருள்காக்குந்
தொல்லிசைத் தொழின்மாக்கள்
காய்சினந்த கதிர்ச்செல்வன்
றேர்பூண்ட மாஅபோல
வைகறொறு மசைவின்றி
யுல்குசெயக் குறைபடாது
வான்முகந்தநீர் மலைப்பொழியவு
மலைப்பொழிந்தநீர் கடற்பரப்பவு
மாரிபெய்யும் பருவம்போல
நீரினின்று நிலத்தேற்றவு
நிலத்தினின்று நீர்ப்பரப்பவு
மளந்தறியாப் பலபண்டம்
வரம்பறியாமை வந்தீண்டி
யருங்கடிப் பெருங்காப்பின்
வலியுடை வல்லணங்கினோன்
புலி பொறித்து............"   (ll. 119-135)

*   *   *

தீம்புகார்த் திரைமுன்றுறைத்
தூங்குநாவாய் துவன்றிருக்கை
மிசைக்கூம்பி னசைக்கொடியும்   (ll. 173-175)

*   *   *

நீரின் வந்த நிமிர்பரிப் புரவியுங்
காலின் வந்த கருங்கறி மூடையும்
வடமலைப் பிறந்த மணியும் பொன்னுங்
குடமலைப் பிறந்த வாரமு மகிலுங்

கங்கை வாரியுங் காவிரிப் பயனு
மீழத் துணவுங் காழகத் தாக்கமு
மரியவும் பெரியவு நெரிய வீண்டி
வளந்தலை மயங்கிய நனந்தலை மறுகின்'' (ll. 185-193)

Maduraikkāñci, another poem in that collection which celebrates the victor of the Talaiyālaṅkānam battle, contains the following on the trade activities of that period:—

''வானியைந்த விருமுந்நீர்ப்
பேஎநிலைஇய விரும்பௌவத்துக்
கொடும்புணரி விலங்குபோழக்
கடுங்காலொடு கரைசேர
நெடுங்கொடிமிசை யிதையெடுத்
தின்னிசைய முரசமுழங்கப்
பொன்மலிந்த விழுப்பண்ட
நாடார நன்கிழிதரு
மாடியற் பெருநாவாய்
மழைமுற்றிய மலைபுரையத்
துறைமுற்றிய துளங்கிருக்கைத்
தெண்கடற் குண்டகழிச்
சீர்சான்ற வுயர்நெல்லி
னூர்கொண்ட வுயர்கொற்றவ (ll. 75-88)

* * *

விழுமிய நாவாய் பெருநீ ரோச்சுநர்
நனந்தலைத் தேஎத்து நன்கல னுய்ம்மார்
புணர்ந்துடன் கொணர்ந்த புரவியொ டனைத்தும்
வைக றொறும் வழிவழிச் சிறப்ப'' (ll. 321-324)

* * *

வாலிதை யெடுத்த வளிதரு வங்கம்
பல்வேறு பண்ட மிழிதரும் பட்டினத்
தொல்லெ னிமிழிசை மானக் கல்லென
நனந்தலை வினைஞர் கலங்கொண்டு மறுகப்
பெருங்கடற் குட்டத்துப் புலவுத்திரை யோத
மிருங்கழி மருவிப் பாயப் பெரிதெழுந்
துருகெழு பானாள் வருவன பெயர்தலிற்
பல்வேறு புள்ளி னிசையெழுந் தற்றே.'' (ll. 536-543)

Certainly these are contemporary descriptions of the commercial life of the Tamils of that period. A compa-

rison of these two sets of writings places the conclusion of their identical age beyond any doubt. If the western trade came to a sudden close by the Alexandrian massacre of 215 A.D., only to be revived a little at the end of the fifth century during the time of Zeno, the commercial activity described in the Sangam works should necessarily be ascribed to a period preceding the beginning of the third century A.D. By this line of evidence too the chronological determination here attempted is confirmed in a most satisfactory manner.

(d) Numismatic.

70. This foreign trade of the South led to an inflow of Roman coinage into Tamiḻagam. Large fields of *aureus* and *denarius* were discovered in such places as Poḷḷacci, Veḷḷāḷūr, Karuvūr, Kalayamuttūr, Kaṇṇanūr, Madura and other places. These Roman coins are the existing symbols of the amount of pepper, pearls, beryl, and other articles exported by the Tamil countries during the first two centuries of the Christian era. We are told that so great was the depletion of the Roman treasury[1] that, in course of time, the later Roman emperors not possessing the military genius of their predecessors for conquest and plunder and the later Roman people not being addicted to any industrial pursuit to replenish their riches, it brought about a depreciation of currency. However adversely it may have affected Rome, the Tamil land was literally basking then in the sunshine of commercial prosperity. This large find of Roman imperial coins could not have come into the Tamil country after the third century A.D. If one were still to assume that this money flowed into the land after the third or the fourth century, I have to urge that apart from the stoppage of the western trade due to the Alex-

(1) On this subject Mr. W. H. Schoff writes as follows in p. 219 of his *Periplus*: The drain of specie from Rome to the East has already been referred to under section 49 and is bitterly condemned by Pliny. "The subject," he says, (VI. 26), "is one well worthy of notice, seeing that in no year does India drain us of less than 550,000,000 *sesterces* giving back her own wares which are sold among us at fully 100 times their first cost."

andrian massacre and to the decadence of the Roman power, the later political and social conditions of Tamilagam also render that hypothesis altogether unthinkable. Passing over the Sangam works, the only witnesses for the sea-borne trade of that period, we are struck by the universal and absolute silence of the mediæval and later Tamil literature about this foreign commercial activity. This, in itself, is an eloquent testimony that the time for the influx of the Roman coins is earlier than the third century A.D. The reference to the coins of Emperor Claudius in the following notes by Prof. E. J. Rapson appearing in p. 162 of his *Ancient India,* only confirms this view. He writes: "Evidence of trade with Rome is afforded by the numerous Roman coins which have been discovered in various districts of Southern India. Among them has been found the gold piece which was struck by the Emperor Claudius (41-54 A.D.) to commemorate the conquest of Britain. Further evidence of the trade between Southern India and the West is supplied by words. Our pepper comes to us from the Tamil *pippali* through the Greek *peperi.*" Mr. W. H. Schoff summarizes his study of South Indian Coinage thus: "The coins of Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius and Nero are numerous. There are very few of Vespasian and Titus anywhere in India. Those of Domitian, Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian are frequent; then there comes another break lasting until the time of Commodus." To facilitate a comparison of the time of the Roman and Tamil rulers of the period I append a tabular statement in the next page.

SYNCHRONISTIC TABLE OF THE TAMIL KINGS AND ROMAN EMPERORS.

Period.	Tamil kings of the Chōḻa dynasty.	Period.	Roman Emperors.	Coinage.
50 B.C.— 25 B.C. ..	Veliyan Tittaṉ ..	39 B.C.— 14 A.D.	Agustus Cæsar ..	....
25 B.C.— 1 A.D. ..	Tittan Veliyan ..			
1 A.D.— 25 A.D. ..	Pōrvaikkō Perunaṟkiḷḷi ..	14 A.D.— 37 A.D.	Tiberius ..	Numerous.
		37 A.D.—41 A.D.	Caligula ..	Do.
25 A.D.— 50 A.D. ..	Vēl-pah-taḍakkai-Perunaṟkiḷḷi ..	(Opening of the sea-route).		
		41 A.D.— 54 A.D.	Claudius ..	Do.
		54 A.D.— 68 A.D.	Nero ..	Do.
50 A.D.— 75 A.D. ..	Uruva-pah-tēr Ilañ-cēḍceṉni ..	68 A.D.— 69 A.D.	Galba ..	....
		69 A.D.— 79 A.D.	Vespasian ..	Very few.
		79 A.D.— 81 A.D.	Titus ..	Do.
75 A.D.—100 A.D. ..	Karikālan the Great ..	81 A.D.— 96 A.D.	Domitian ..	Frequent.
		96 A.D.— 98 A.D.	Nerva ..	Do.
100 A.D.—125 A.D. ..	Cēḍceṉni Nalaṅkiḷḷi ..	98 A.D.—117 A.D.	Trajan ..	Do.
		117 A.D.—138 A.D.	Hadrian ..	Do.
125 A.D.—150 A.D. ..	Kuḷamuṟṟattu-tuñciya-Kiḷḷi-Vaḷavan ..	138 A.D.—161 A.D.	Antoninus Pius ..	Break.
150 A.D.—175 A.D. ..	Rājasūyam Vēṭṭa Perunaṟkiḷḷi ..	161 A.D.—169 A.D.	Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus ..	....
		169 A.D.—180 A.D.	Marcus Aurelius ..	....
175 A.D.—200 A.D. ..	Kō-Ceṅkaṇṇan ..	180 A.D.—192 A.D.	Commodus ..	....
		193 A.D.—211 A.D.	Septimius Severus ..	....
		211 A.D.—217 A.D.	Caracalla (Alexandrian Massacre from which period trade began to decline) ..	

The preceding Table shows that, even before the Alexandrian massacre loomed on the horizon, the Roman trade had begun to flag in the Indian waters from about the middle of the second century A.D. The period of Karikālan the Great also shows a visible depression and one may trace it not only to the troubles at Rome but also to the incessant military preoccupations of that great conqueror. Still, we shall not be justified in concluding that the commercial activities of his period came completely to a standstill. Numismatic evidence too, as far as it goes, brings Tamiḻagam into intimate relation with Rome during the first two centuries of the Christian era and strengthens the chronological fixation otherwise arrived at.

In fine, we find all the lines of evidence, Political, Geographical, Commercial and Numismatic, converging to establish the correctness of the allocation of the Ten Generations between 50 B.C. and 200 A.D., with of course a narrow margin for any possible error on either side. The nature and drift of these confirmatory evidences, together with the impossibility of an alternative re-adjustment of the references of the *Periplus*, Pliny and Ptolemy in their application to the Tables, will certainly not favour any material variation in the chronological distribution of the generations herein made. No doubt, the arrangement falls short of the ideal of absolute certitude; but in matters of ancient history would any one demand it? It can be cherished only as a limit for our patient and laborious approximation.

Two Types of Investigators.

71. I am aware that the result thus far attained in fixing the chronology of the early Tamil sovereigns and poets will please neither the party which launches into a very high antiquity and fabulises everything connected with the start of Tamil literary history nor that other group of scholars who are ever engaged in bringing down the age of the so-called Sangam works to quite modern times. These, too, create fables of their own to

modernise, if possible, this ancient stratum of Tamil literature. From the very beginning of this inquiry the ideal has been steadily kept in view to carefully avoid falling into the attitude of either of these schools of investigation. The Tables will show how the instreaming evidence has been meekly followed instead of my attempting to tutor it for establishing a pre-conceived theory of my own.

Before those who try to take these early 'Sangam' works far too high into the pre-Christian centuries, I have to place such considerations as the following. It can hardly be denied that though this body of literature bears a faint impress of the contact of Aryan Hinduism, it is not without marks of heterodox systems of religious thought. Jainism and Buddhism might be supposed to have come into Tamilagam at about the middle of the third century B.C. Accordingly, this particular body of literature cannot be taken beyond 250 B.C. The Synchronistic Tables, it will be noted, starts with 50 B.C. Now in order to meet the demands of these scholars, if we try to shift the ten generations to the two centuries and a half preceding the Christian era, keeping, of course, the references of the *Periplus* and of Ptolemy to their present respective points of time, would it be possible to bring these references to any intelligible relation with the facts of Tamil History? Ptolemy's reference to the Aayi country would stand separated from the Pāndiyan annexation of that territory by nearly three centuries. The proposed shifting would thus arouse more historical difficulties than it would solve.

Against those who try to bring down the date of the 'Sangam' works nearer the fifth century A.D., or thereabouts, stand the many presumptions that arise from the linguistic and literary development of Tamil as well as the considerations due to the primitive social, religious and political conditions the early works testify to. The comparative absence of Sanskrit in their vocabulary, their peculiar grammatical forms, their distinctive style of versifi-

cation and subject-matter, their enigmatic names and expressions and the change in the meaning of many of their words, their freedom from literary conventions, religious motive and mythic overgrowth, mark these works out as belonging to a much anterior stratum in the growth of Tamil Language and Literature. The absence of a developed caste system, the practice of cattle-lifting and the burial of the dead under stone-mounds and in urns and a system of primitive religion without the worship of most of the gods and goddesses of the Hindu pantheon, all tell their own tale of an antiquity that could not be effectively brought into connection with the complicated social and religious conditions of later times. The political system reflected in this literature was entirely untouched by the Pallava rule whose characteristic influences began to permeate Tamiḻagam from the fifth or the sixth century onwards for a considerable time. Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar, in some of his writings, has called special attention to the pre-Pallava character of this literature and has stoutly and very justly opposed the fantastic attempts of some at postdating these early Tamil works.

Turning to the history of literary development in the Tamil land, we find important intervening landmarks between the early period and the modern. Let us start with the beginning of the seventh century, the age of Tiruggñānasambanda, one of the definitely settled periods in Tamil History. In moving back to antiquity we have to find a place for such a work as *Cilappadikāram* and possibly also for *Maṇimēkalai*.[1] Then we should move still higher

(1) In a correct view *Maṇimēkalai* should be considered a much later work than *Cilappadikāram*. It is little else than a pale imitation of the latter. It arose as a complementary work to *Cilappadikāram* exactly as in later times the *Uttara Rāmāyaṇam of Vāṇidāsan* came to supplement Kamban's great epic. The connection of the subject and stories is indeed too strong in those instances to permit popular fancy and even learned but uncritical opinion to keep the original works and their sickly, lifeless, 'rule of thumb' imitations apart, with due appreciation of the stretch of time which should intervene and separate them. In the case of *Maṇimēkalai*, the effacement of the time-gap was rendered wonderfully easy by a gross misidentification of two authors. The author of *Maṇimēkalai* was one Kūlavāṇikan Cāttan, Cāttan, the grain-

up for the Ethical Period which should spread over at least one or two centuries, locating *Kuṟaḷ* and *Tolkāppiyam* at about this time. We have also to find room for the development of such Naturalistic works as *Ainkuṟunūṟu, Kalittogai* and such portions of the *Pattuppāṭṭu* as are not covered by the Synchronistic Tables. Do not all these stages of literary growth require at the least four centuries—the period which now separates the age of the Synchronistic Tables from that of Tirugñānasambanda? If anything, the period is only too short for the variety and complexity of the literary phenomena which one has perforce to locate in it.

Such considerations as the above which favour a high antiquity but still do not permit us to go very far in that direction cannot affect in the least the testimony of the positive historic evidences by which the chronology of the early Tamils has been settled in this paper. They are, however, urged here solely to bespeak a frame of mind in some scholars for a dispassionate weighing and valuation of the evidence offered and settling a much-contested question of great importance to Tamil History.

72. The fixation of chronology, I have herein tried to arrive at, is after all not quite new. As generally happens with most truths, this truth too has been adumbrated in a number of works of pre-

Previous Attempts.

merchant. And among the Sangam group of poets, a poet under the name Cittalai Cāttan, Cāttan of the village Cittalai, appears to have lived and composed some poems which are included in certain of the 'Ettuttokai' collections. These two poets were two distinct individuals belonging to two different ages separated in all probability by about five centuries or so. And yet we find the editor of *Maṇimēkalai*, at one stroke of his pen, trying to annihilate the distance of time by giving in the title-page of that work, the author's name as 'Kūlavāṇikan Cittalai Cāttan'. I have not yet been able to alight on this particular individual in any of the early works, commentators' stories apart. They give us Cittalai Cāttan and Kūlavāṇikan Cāttan, but nowhere in them do we come across the mixed individual 'Kūlavāṇikan Cittalai Cāttan'. I call the special attention of the reader to this flagrant misidentification simply because it has badly dislocated the chronology of ancient Tamil literature and has apparently misled scholars like Dr. S. Krishnaswamy Aiyangar to fight a pitched but, I think, a losing battle for *Maṇimēkalai* being at least taken to the Sangam age, if not included in the Sangam collections.

vious scholars. Dr. Vincent Smith writes in p. 457 of his *Early History* "The Early Tamil poetical literature, dating according to competent expert opinion, from the first three centuries of the Christian Era, gives a vivid picture of the state of society of that period." Evidently the historian in penning this line had in his mind the pioneer work of the late Mr. Kanakasabhai Pillai and the writings of Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar. Whatever one may urge regarding the valuation by these scholars of early Tamil Literature in detail, there is little doubt that the conclusions of the first writer in respect of the age of the Sangam works are approximately and broadly correct and fairly enough accordant with the facts of early Tamil History. I am glad that my conclusion generally coincides with his, though I have opened and trodden a new path altogether. The present essay would, I hope, rescue Tamil Chronology from the vagueness and uncertainties which have clustered round it by the inveterate practice of certain scholars of using such poems as *Cilappadikāram, Maṇimēkalai* and *Mahāvamso* as mines of unquestionable historical information. Hereafter at least, I trust, one can talk of Tamil Chronology as historically determined without the fear of being heckled on the fantastic imaginative constructions of poets like Ilangō Aḍigaḷ and Kūlavāṇikan Cāttan and on the interested fabrications of a monkish chronicler like the author of the *Mahāvamso*.

PART IV.

RESULTS.

73. We have now to glance back and ascertain to what extent the Synchronistic Tables have contributed to our knowledge of ancient Tamil history. Till now one could not talk of the history of the Tamils without laying oneself open to challenge and hostile criticism. The facts of ancient Tamil history, enshrined in the early poems and set in a highly artificial grouping, were not quarried systematically, nor sifted and arranged chronologically so as to enable readers to get a clear, consecutive and intelligible account of a past not so much forgotten as muddled.

Preliminary.

74. But now the various facts of language and literature, of social life and thought, of political vicissitudes and wars of ambition, have been thrown into such a framework of Relative Chronology that we are in a position to know something about the succession of the Ten Generations comprised in the Tables. At least for two centuries and a half these Tables furnish a time-chart, which will enable us to interrelate the events in their true order of historical succession. Poets like Kaḻāttalaiyār and Muḍamōsiyār, Paraṇar and Kapilar, Nakkīrar and Marudan Iḷanāgan will stand hereafter in different generations and not thrown together and considered as contemporaries. Likewise, kings like Tittan and Veḷiyan, Uruvapah-tēr-Iḷañcēḍcenni and Karikālan the Great, Rājasūyam Vēṭṭa Perunaṟkiḷḷi and Kō Ceṅkaṇṇan should henceforward occupy distinct niches in ancient Chōḻa history and there will hardly be any justification for consigning them all to a nondescript class of almost shadowy kings of a shadowy past.

(i) Relative Chronology.

75. In addition to throwing light on the relative time of the generations herein treated, the Tables have enabled us to make a significant comparison between some of their facts and those recorded in the works of certain early Greek and Roman writers and deduce therefrom the absolute chronology of the Generations. Both the main evidence of the Tables and the accessory evidences which gather round it establish, in the clearest manner, that the distribution of the Ten Generations should lie between 50 B.C. and 200 A.D., as their highly probable extreme limits on either side. This arrangement is solely the result of the valuation of the intrinsic evidences available in the early works. It happens also that the extreme errors of the two types of investigators hereinbefore indicated have been avoided and one can hereafter hope to assert with some confidence that the dating of the early Tamil poems has arrived at almost a satisfactory, if not, a final stage.

(ii) Absolute Chronology.

76. The Tables furnish the most authentic information about the founding of the three capitals, Uṟaiyūr, Karuvūr and Kūḍal. The conquest and occupation of these cities lie within the period of the first three generations, *i.e.*, between 50 B.C. and 25 A.D. Are we to conclude from this that the Tamils did not play a prominent part in the history of culture and civilization before that time? By no means can we perform that jump. The life of a nation is not coterminous with its politics, much less with that type of it called the monarchical. In all probability, the earliest form of Tamil rule, of which we are afforded some glimpses here and there in this literature, was a sort of communal republic wherein each adult male member of the community had a voice in the direction of public affairs. Although we discover the Pāṇḍiya and the Chēra rulers as full-fledged kings, the origin of the Chōḻa line of sovereigns throws considerable light on the primitive communal republics. The people

(iii) The Establishment of the Tamil Kingships in their respective Capitals.

seem to have existed as village communities under the direction of Kiḻārs or the village elders. The eldest member of the family had the direction of affairs in his hands, assisted of course by the village assembly periodically convoked. The term 'Kiḻamai' means right of possession. This abstract concept is undoubtedly a later growth and should have denoted at first the right of the village elders or Kiḻavar. In course of time, the village communities grew in number and size and then they held together as a union or confederacy of a number of such communities presided over by a Vēḷ, Kō or king. This Vēḷ or Kō had a number of Kiḻārs under him each representing a village. Though the Kiḻārs and Vēḷs were the executive heads and presidents of their respective village assemblies and confederacies, their powers were probably very limited in peace time by the authority of the general assemblies of the villages. This type of political organisation was wholly the result of the peaceful and settled condition of an agricultural community, organised for peaceful pursuits. It is to these early types of communal republics that the Aśoka's edict refers. No name of an individual king is therein mentioned in the south, as in the case of the western sovereigns. They are called the Chōḻas, the Paḻayas, the Kēraḷaputras and the Satiyaputras, all communal names beyond doubt. It would be highly unhistorical to read the type of princely autocracies evolved later on in the Tamil land into the early conditions of the third century B.C. All that is intended to be conveyed here is that the Tamil autocracies depicted in these works were certainly preceded by another type of political organisation which was peculiarly republican and Dravidian in its character. By the time of the generations comprised in the Tables the old organisation had well-nigh lost its original vigour and a process of dissolution had set in. For territorial expansion the peaceful agricultural communities seem to have placed themselves under leaders of military genius, who later on turned

into autocrats, pure and simple, and robbed the communities of their original rights and powers. In short, independence was the heavy price the communities had to pay, for the doubtful advantage of new territorial acquisitions. This is the picture we get from the earliest references bearing on the Chōḻa rule.

Turning to the periods succeeding the Ten Generations of the Tables, we find in each line about half-a-dozen, more or less, of sovereigns still remaining to be assigned their proper place in history. All these obviously belong to later generations. Their combined reigns, consistently with the calculation of the time of the generations we have herein followed, may extend perhaps to another century or a century and a half at the highest. That takes us to 350 A.D., exactly the period when the Pallava power got itself lodged in Kānci-puram. All the Tamil kings suddenly go under an eclipse and the poets of the period had to sing of other themes than their patrons' glories, presumably for want of the old type of patrons. The kings, no doubt, must have been there holding court; but one can justly infer from the lack of literary record that they should have been shorn of much of the power and prestige enjoyed by their early ancestors. Although much is not known about the Kaḷabhra interregnum,[1] the dark period of Tamil history, it is highly probable that it marked the first incursion of a border race from the north into the Tamil states. The hypothesis that this movement was only a fore-runner of the general Pallava invasion which later on swept through the land can scarcely be considered an extravagant one. Whatever be the subsequent history of the Tamil country, the Tables have to close with Kō-Ceṅkaṇṇan. And between him and Tiru-gñānasambanda, four centuries intervene, centuries whose gloom is lighted up neither by the early poems nor by

(1) *Vide* Appendix XI for the Numismatic evidence bearing on this Period.

later epigraphs. The late Prof. P. Sundaram Pillai in his *Age of Tirugñānasambanda* expressed the hope that this period could be approached with profit from the other side—the Kō-Ceṅkaṇṇan period.[1] The approach does not, however, seem anywise promising; still future research, let us hope, will let in some gleams into this dark and irretrievably blank period.

(iv) The Ruin of the earlier Independent Chieftaincies.

77. The Tables throw into clear relief the fact that the Tamil monarchies, with no very considerable territories at the beginning, began to prey upon their neighbouring chieftaincies and in course of time developed themselves into extensive kingdoms. In the space of five generations from the third, most of the tribal chieftaincies scattered throughout the southern half of the Peninsula were either annexed or made tributary states. As we move down the times we find the independent chieftains being replaced by others who owned fealty and military service to the paramount powers, and also by the commanders of royal armies and other officers in the regular employ of those rulers. Titles like Enādi and Kāvidi were first brought into vogue from the time of Karikālan the Great onwards and were conferred on officers distinguished for their service either civil or military. In lieu of a regular salary these officers held feudal estates in

(1) Prof. Sundaram Pillai embodied his considered opinions on this point in the following paragraphs:

"We have already pointed out that Sambandha frequently refers to the famous Chōḻa prince Kō Chengannan, the hero of the classical war-song *Kalavaḻi*. On one occasion, he speaks of a temple of Vaigal, a village near Kumbaconam, as having been constructed by Kō Chengannan in former days. Clearly then Sambandha must have lived a considerable time after this temple-building red-eyed Chōḻa. But when did this red-eyed Chōḻa live? The question opens a field of inquiry as wide as the whole range of classics in Tamil—a sphere obviously more beset with historical difficulties than that of the sacred Śaiva literature with which we have been hitherto concerned.

The further we proceed into antiquity, the darker naturally becomes the view around; and it is well, for more than one reason, to leave this part of our subject to be taken up on a future occasion, for an independent and separate handling which the range and importance of those ancient classics would otherwise also demand."

their possession and became petty rulers under their respective sovereigns. We meet with such chiefs as Ārkkāṭṭu Kiḻār, Karuvūr Kiḻār, Ollaiyūr Kiḻār, after the conquest of Ārkkāḍu, Karuvūr, and Ollaiyūr by the Tamil kings. The invariable policy of these kings was thus to create new types of chiefs and to bestow on them a part of their fresh conquests for occasional military service.

(v) The Beginning of Aryanisation.

78. The Tables further disclose that to the kings who preceded Karikālan the Great, the Aryan rite of performing *Yāgas* was utterly unknown. Karikālan and his contemporary Paḷsālai Mudukuḍumi Peruvaḻudi were the first sovereigns who had recourse to this new method of glorifying their conquests and securing the favour of the Gods. Ever since that time Aryan Hinduism and its priesthood began to enjoy some sort of royal favour and patronage, which grew with the growth of time and came to be rooted in the land. Still it would not be true to say that Aryanism had got a strong hold on the people at the time we just now treat of. That event should stand over till we reach the Religious epoch which synchronises with the Pallava occupation of Kāñcipuram and the overlording of the Tamil kingdoms by that power from the fifth or the sixth century onwards.

(vi) The legendary nature of the Sangam Story.

79. The Tables establish in the most convincing manner that the so-called 'third Sangam' was a figment of imagination of the commentator of *Iṟaiyanār Agapporuḷ.* Many scholars till now have shown a partiality for holding that at least this third Sangam should have some historical basis, however mythical the preceding two Sangams may be.[1] But the truth, as is conveyed by the Tables, is that this much-vaunted third Sangam too is an imaginary creation and should share the fate of its predecessors. That *Tiruvaḷḷuvamālai,* con-

(1) *Vide* Appendix XII: Prof. W. F. Clifford on the Authority of Traditions.

taining the complimentary stanzas about *Kuṛaḷ* by the forty-nine poets of the third Academy, is a barefaced forgery is an easy deduction from the facts brought out and arranged in the Tables. Poets who lived in different generations have been thrown together and made to sit in one assembly. Nariveruttalaiyār, Toḍittalai Viḻuttaṇḍinār, Kapilar, Paraṇar, Mōsi Kīranār, Kallāḍanār, Kārikkaṇṇanār of Kāvirippaṭṭinam, Nakkīrar, Dāmōdaranār, the Physician, Arisil Kiḻār, Māṅkuḍi Marudanār and Kōvūr Kiḻār appear in different generations in the Tables and all these have been jumbled together and made contemporaries. To render it still worse, much later poets than these, as Māmūlanār and Cīttalai Cāttanār, have also been brought in to form the third Academy! And what is even more startling than this is the inclusion of Perundēvanār, the author of the first Tamil *Bhāratam*, and poet who sang the invocatory stanzas for most of the Sangam collections of poems, so as to allow him to play his part in this somewhat incongruous Academy! Discrepancies between the *Tiruvaḷḷuvamālai* account[1] and the version of the *Agapporuḷ* commentator apart, the story of the third Sangam is in itself, as has been pointed out already, a clear fabrication in many of its details. It is true that the author or authors of the Sangam legend did not wholly spin out an imaginary tale with imaginary characters created for the occasion. They seem to have utilized the names of certain historic personages of a past time and constructed a pure legend from which the time-element was wholly expunged and characters belonging to different ages brought in as members of one literary body. The grain of historical truth contained in the account of the Academy lies in the historicity of the individual poets brought into it and not in the fact of the Sangam itself as such. These accounts then are little better than historical romances, which should never be confounded with histories proper. One

(1) *Vide* Appendix XIII: Note on *Tiruvaḷḷuvamālai*.

side of educated opinion till now has been viewing this Sangam story with some sort of suspicion but it could not successfully assail the many *a priori* arguments, too dearly loved and too confidently urged by the many upholders of the Academy in this controversy. Hereafter at least *a priori* arguments will be found to be of little avail against the positive facts disclosed by the Tables which disprove in the most convincing manner the historicity of the third Sangam.

(vii) Lateness of the redaction of the Sangam works.

80. The Tables further establish that the redaction of the Sangam works attributed to the patronage of different kings was all a later manipulation with the names of the earlier sovereigns for heightening the antiquity and authority of the various collections. Leaving out of account *Puṟanāṉūṟu,* whose redactor and patron are not known, *Agānanūṟu* stands to the credit of Ukkirapperuvaḻudi, *Naṟṟiṇai* to Pannāḍu-tanta-Pāṇḍiyan and *Kuṟuntogai* to Pūrikkō. Of these, the first two appear in the Tables separated from each other by about four generations. Pūrikkō must be a later sovereign than these. Separated as these kings were by many generations, how could one and the same classification based on the number of lines in a verse, for instance, be considered as having been effected by a number of patrons living centuries apart? Internal evidence of the collections themselves militates against any such supposition. This will be evidenced from the valuation of the different works of the Sangam literature in the light of the facts embodied in the Tables. And to this I shall now pass on.

(viii) Light thrown on Sangam Literature.

81. The Tables make it abundantly clear that the various works called in the lump 'the Third Sangam Literature' belong to four or five centuries at the lowest and have been the result of the unwonted literary activity which marked off that period from the

succeeding. They were composed by different poets, and on various occasions and with various motives. To judge correctly each of these works it is absolutely necessary to restore each to its correct historical *milieu*. Throwing them together into one promiscuous heap without any regard for the time of their composition and arranging them merely on grounds of prosody or rhetoric are certainly not the correct method to facilitate any historical handling of them. I have to acknowledge with sorrow that the popular veneration in which such collections are held to this day has only delayed the chronological arrangement of their contents and the preparation of a scientific history on their well-ascertained basis.

(a) 'Ettutokai' or the Eight Collections.

82. Taking the 'Eight Collections', the Tables show that two of them are assignable to a later period, *viz.*, *Kalittogai* and *Pari-pāḍal*. Of the four basic works, *Aga-nānūṟu* is said to have been collected under the patronage of the Pāṇḍiya king Ukkirapperu-vaḻudi of the ninth generation. If this were so, how could this collection contain the poems of numerous poets of later times, *viz.*, Māmūlanār, Kōṭṭampalattu-tunciya-Chēramān, Pāṇḍiyan Aṟivuḍai Nambi, Peruṅkaḍuṅkō, the singer of 'Pālai', Iḻaṅkaḍuṅkō, the singer of 'Marutam', and Cīttalai Cāttanār? Turning to *Naṟṟiṇai*, collected during the time of Pannāḍu-tanta-Pāṇḍiyan of the fifth generation, we find the same interpolation of later poems into that work also. The same is the case with *Aiṅkuṟunūṟu* ascribed to the Chēran of 'the elephant look' of the eighth generation. These instances are sufficient to prove that the collections, as a matter of fact, were not done during the reigns to which they now stand ascribed, but were the result of a much later enterprise. The question of fixing definitely the time of the redaction does not, however, arise in this connection. The positive testimony of the Tables is against supposing these kings as being the patrons of these collections, which according to the uncorroborated

testimony of tradition now stand in their names. *Patiṟṟup-pattu* seems to fall in line with the Tables, though some of its poets do not appear to have any organic relation with the personages of the latter.

(b) 'Pattuppattu' or the Ten Idylls.

83. As regards the *Ten Idylls*, the Tables offer the most interesting fund of information. Long and sustained compositions on set themes first come into vogue in the reign of Karikālan the Great. The poems included in this collection certainly belong to different generations and are a slow growth of centuries. Most of them have sprung from three roots, *viz., Poru-narāṟṟuppaḍai, Paṭṭinappālai* and *Mullaippāṭṭu*. These earliest pieces formed the models on which the later seven do seem to have been composed. Of the latter, three come within the period of the Tables and the remaining four, falling outside. I shall for greater clearness append in the next page a chart of. descent of the various poems in this collection based on the facts of the Tables as well as on the internal testimony of language and thought of the poems themselves.

Scheme of Development of the Poems in the 'Pattupattu' Collection as evidenced by the Tables.

Falling within the period of the Synchronistic Tables (75 A.D.—200 A.D.).

I. *Porunarārruppadai* by poet Mudattāmakkanniyār re Karikālan the Great.

II. *Pattinappālai* by poet Uruttiran Kannanār re Karikālan the Great.

III. *Mullaippāttu* by poet Nappūdanār (probably of the same period).

IV. *Maduraikkāñci* by poet Māṅkudi Marudan re Talaiyālaṅkānattu-Ceru-Venra-Pāndiyan.

V. *Nedunalvādai* by poet Nakkīrar re Talaiyālaṅkānattu-Ceru-Venra-Pāndiyan.

VI. *Perumpānārruppadai* by poet Uruttiran Kannanār II, re Tondaimān Ilantirayan.

Falling after 200 A.D.

Genuine.

VII. *Cirupānārruppadai* by poet Nallūr Nattattanār re Nalliyakkōdan.

VIII. *Malaipadukadām* by poet Peruṅkousikanār re Nannan, son of Nannan.

Forged.

X. *Tirumurugārruppadai.* (ascribed to Nakkīrar.)

IX. *Kuriñcippāttu.* (ascribed to Kapilar.)

I shall now proceed to explain the scheme given in a graphic manner in the preceding page. *Maduraikkāñci* of Māṅkuḍi Marudan is modelled upon *Paṭṭinappālai* and belongs to the seventh generation; *Neḍunalvāḍai* is an offshoot of the root *Mullaippāṭṭu* and belongs to the eighth; and *Perumpāṇāṟṟuppaḍai*[1] is the direct descendant of *Porunarāṟṟuppaḍai* and comes in the tenth and last generation included in the Tables. Thus we see that the three fundamental works of Karikālan's time served as models for later poets, who composed three other works within the period of the Tables. The form and make-up of *Porunarāṟṟuppaḍai* and *Perumpāṇāṟṟuppaḍai* led to further imitations like *Ciṟupāṇāṟṟuppaḍai* and *Malaipaṭukaḍām*. So eight poems on the whole seem to have come into existence in process of time and they are all genuine pieces sung by different poets in honour of different patrons. But, in all probability, at the time of the redaction two more poems were composed and added to bring up the total to ten it may be, or to serve such motives as the religious, the literary, etc. I have the strongest suspicion about the genuineness of the two remaining Idylls, *Kuṟiñcippāṭṭu* and *Tirumurugāṟṟuppaḍai*. These seem to be decidedly later compositions done at the time of the redaction and assigned to certain earlier poets, whose very names would have been held as carrying weight with the people. In short, I consider these two pieces as little short of forgeries committed and fathered upon two of the foremost Sangam celebrities. Kapilar and Nakkīrar must have been dead long before these poems were composed and circulated in their names. Or if these be taken as the productions of Kapilar and Nakkīrar, we have no other way than to conclude that these authors must undoubtedly be different individuals going under the same names as the earlier poets. In view of the inveterate tendency of certain later writers to produce and foist

(1) This work may have been known merely as *Pāṇāṟṟuppaḍai*, before the composition of another Pāṇāṟṟuppaḍai after its pattern. The collector of the poems must have, at the time of the redaction, added the adjectives *peru* and *Ciṟu* to the titles of the two pieces to distinguish them.

their works on some well-known ancient personages, I am inclined to hold this 'Kapilar' and this 'Nakkīrar' more as pen-names than real. I have arrived at this conclusion mainly on linguistic grounds though historical considerations too are not wanting. Taking *Kuṟiñcippāṭṭu* it has this significant line:

"பைவிரி யல்குற் கொய்தழை தைஇ."

Here the word 'அல்குல்' is evidently used in the modern sense of the privities. But the challenge may be confidently entered whether any one could point out a single instance in the ancient poets where the word has this specialised meaning. Wherever the ancient poets use that word they denote by it the entire hip below the waist. Accordingly this specialised later meaning stamps *Kuṟiñcippāṭṭu* as a very late product separated by some centuries from the period of the earlier stratum of the 'Sangam' poems. Turning to *Tirumurugāṟṟuppaḍai*, that also contains a tell-tale line:

"ஆண்டலைக் கொடியொடு மண்ணி யமைவர"

Here 'ஆண்டலை' is used in the later sense, 'a cock'; whereas the Sangam poets invariably use this word as denoting an unidentified almost mythical bird with a human-like head frequenting burial grounds and other waste places. No doubt, in this instance the commentator exercises his ingenuity to save the antiquity of the composition by reading the word with the sandhi as 'māṇḍalai'. That this is however wasted ingenuity can be easily understood from the poet's many references to the cock-ensign of God Muruga's flag in other parts of the same poem (*vide* lines 38, 210-11, 219). Again, both *Kuriñcippāṭṭu* (line 228) and *Tirumurugāṟṟuppadai* (line 115) use the word 'இரட்டுதல்' in a sense quite unknown to the early poets, who invariably denote by it, the noise issuing from *two* bodies sounding either alternately or simultaneously. This specific meaning expressive of the origin of

the word faded away in the course of a few centuries and by the time of the two works we are now discussing the word had been generalised to mean all manner of sounds without distinction. Taking the early poets, not one of them, as far as I can see, has used 'இரட்டுதல்' in the sense of merely 'ஒலித்தல்', thus depriving it of its radical significance. The history of this little word is enough to determine once for all the late age to which these two poems should be ascribed. Then again, the very name 'Tirumurugāṟṟuppaḍai' and the peculiar change in the linguistic usage it exhibits argue also for the very late growth of that poem.[1] A comparative study of the significance of words used in these poems also leads me to confirm the conclusion above set forth. A more detailed presentation of the arguments is however not called for in this place.

(c) The Eighteen Didactic Works.

84. There is absolutely no way of bringing the Tables into connection with any of the poems comprised in the eighteen works of the Didactic group. However, tradition is strong on the point that *Kuṟaḷ* marks the fall of the curtain on the Sangam stage. Since all the kings, who appear in the basic works, have not been brought into the Tables, we may take it that *Kuṟaḷ* would fitly come in after the lapse of nearly one or two centuries from the close of the period we have here treated of. For *Tolkāppiyam* also, it is difficult to find a place in these Tables. Though much weight cannot be attached to negative testimony arising from the absence of reference, yet in the case of two such works of first-rate importance as *Kuṟaḷ* and *Tolkāppiyam* and of two such authors of a high order of genius as Tiruvaḷḷuvar and Tolkāppiyar, it is unthinkable that had they existed in these ten generations they would have been left alone in inglorious isolation. The kings themselves would have courted their favour and sought to patronise them by every means in their power. So in the special case of two such

(1) For a detailed discussion, *vide* Appendix XIV: Note on the name 'Tirumurugaṟṟuppaḍai'.

authors, the negative testimony has a significance which can scarcely be overlooked.[1] The twin epics *Cilappadikāram* and *Maṇimēkalai* are of course much later works and need not be discussed here.

(ix) A peep into the previous condition of Tamil Literature and Learning.

85. If the four works on which the Tables are based are the earliest products of the Tamil Muse and are assignable to the first two centuries of the Christian era, it would be interesting to raise the question whether this literature had any fore-runner in a body of works in the pre-Christian centuries or sprang into existence all at once, without any previous preparation. The works, that have been here utilised, show a wealth of grammatical apparatus and literary technique, which stamp them as the finished products of a long-continued literary culture. One has to assume that these presuppose an antecedent condition of literary activity in the Tamil land. Such an activity must also have been preceded by a linguistic stage in which writing should have been introduced for other purposes than literary. The balance of opinion among scholars is in favour of the view that it was the Dravidian merchants who first brought writing into India. Dr. Rhys Davids, in his work '*Buddhist India*', pp. 116-117, formulates the following propositions as a working hypothesis as regards this important question:—

"1. Sea-going merchants availing themselves of the monsoons were in the habit, at the beginning of the seventh (and perhaps at the end of the eighth century B.C.), of trading from ports on the south-west coast of India (Sovira at first, afterwards Suppāraka and Bharukaccha) to Babylon, then a great mercantile emporium.

"2. These merchants were mostly Dravidians, not Āryans. Such Indian names of the goods imported as were adopted in the west (Solomon's Ivory, Apes, and

(1) *Vide* Appendix XV: The Age of Tolkāppiyam.

Peacocks for instance, and the word "rice") were adaptations not of Sanskrit or Pali but of Tamil words.

"3. These merchants there became acquainted with an alphabetic writing derived from that first invented and used by the whole white pre-Semitic race now called Akkadians.

"4. That alphabet had previously been carried by wandering Semitic tribes from Babylon to the West, both north-west and south-west. Some of the particular letters learnt by the Indian merchants are closely allied to letters found on inscriptions recorded by those Semitic tribes, and also on Babylonian weights, both of a date somewhat earlier than the time when the Indians made their trading journeys.

"5. After the merchants brought this script to India, it gradually became enlarged and adapted to suit the special requirements of the Indian learned and colloquial dialects. Nearly a thousand years afterwards the thus adapted alphabet became known as the Brāhmi Lipi, the sublime writing. What name it bore in the interval—for instance, in Aśoka's time—is not known. From it, all the alphabets now used in India, Burma, Siam and Ceylon have been gradually evolved."

In the face of facts justifying propositions like these, the attempt to derive the literary culture of the early Tamils, from the North, is a hopeless one. The tendency of western scholars is to ascribe the rise of this culture in Tamiḻagam to the efforts of the first missionaries of Jainism and Buddhism to the South. This whole hypothesis is built on an impossible supposition. It, in short, demands the taking place of a sort of miracle. Granting, for argument's sake, that the Tamils were an unlettered race with a language not at all cultivated and developed into an efficient instrument of thought, is it possible, one might ask, that such a race and such a language could, all at

once, by the arrival of a few foreign scholars, be taken out of the old rut and placed on the high-road of progress? The utmost period that could intervene between the arrival of these missionaries, assuming it as a historical fact for the present, and the period of these Tables is barely two centuries. Is it possible then that in that short space of time there had occurred the miracle of transforming an uncultivated language into a powerful and at the same time a beautiful medium of literary expression and of reclaiming a nation in a semi-barbarous condition to the ranks of civilization and culture? Such a supposition is too preposterous to be seriously put forward. The only other hypothesis consonant with the facts of early Tamil culture is to consider that it was an indigenous product with distinctive, perhaps even peculiar, features of its own. The comparatively greater antiquity of the Āryan civilisation of the North should not predispose us to deny a fairly high antiquity to the culture of the Dravidian race in the South. I make this modest demand on the strength of the literary evidence alone. If, however, we transcend literary and linguistic evidences to higher periods undeniably testified to by the archæological finds as of Mohenjo Dāro and Harāppa, Dravidian culture, we are given to understand, shoots up to a still more hoary antiquity than even the Vedic. If, then, a long period of literary cultivation of Tamil existed in pre-Christian centuries, how is it that we have not received any evidence of it? The perishable nature of the writing materials alone in a hot climate as in the South must be held answerable for this paucity of early literary testimony. The early Tamils did not certainly take to inscribing on stones or clay tablets, as the Babylonians did. That, above all, should be held as the main reason why literary memorials[1]

(1) *Apropos* the alphabets current in South India, Dr. Burnell inserts a very significant foot-note in p 130 of his *South Indian Palaeography.* He writes: "Comparing the Telugu-Canarese alphabets with the Tamil it is, then, impossible to suppose that the last is the work of Sanskrit grammarians; for had they been the authors of it, it would have been far more perfect and

of ancient Tamil culture have not survived to the present day. As for the positive evidence bearing on the existence of palm-leaf writing in the Tamil country during the period of the Synchronistic Tables, I shall here transcribe a few verses from *Agaṉāṉuṟu*, by an early poet, Marudan Iḷanāgan, who lived in the eighth generation. The poet therein refers to the practice of exchanging letter-scrolls between different members of the mercantile community and borrows from it a striking simile to illustrate a rather frightful sight. The lines are:

"கயிறுபிணிக் குழிசி யோலை கொண்மார்
பொறிகண் டழிக்கு மாவண மாக்களி
னுயிர்திறம் பெயர்ந்த நல்லமர்க் கடந்த
தறுக ணாளர் குடர்தரீஇத் தெறுவரச்
செஞ்செவி யெருவை யஞ்சுவர விகுக்குங்
கல்லதர்க் கவலை."

And their translation: 'The stone-cumbered path wherein the red-eared eagle would drop fearfully the entrails of the fierce warriors, who had died in severe battle, drawing them out (in long trails) just as the merchants, after examining and breaking open the seal, would extract their palm-leaf (missives) from within the (earthen) pot with sides protected by coir-nettings'. This certainly must remove the last vestige of doubt about the prevalence of writing in the

would have shown signs of adaptation which are wanting in it. Add to this that the Tamil letters ḻ ḷ and ṟ are totally distinct from the Telugu-Canarese corresponding letters and ṉ superfluous and the amount of proof that the Vatteluttu is of independent origin and not derived from the South Asokan character appears to be conclusive". Considering the very late introduction into South India of the present Tamil Alphabet—the mongrel Tamil-Grantha character—one can confidently assert that the Tamil literature coming about the first centuries of the Christian era must have been preserved only in the Vaṭṭeḷuttu script. In the light of Dr. Rhys David's views, it is highly probable that Vaṭṭeḷuttu, with all its imperfections and characteristic features, may be nearer to the period of the introduction of the alphabet into South India than even the South Asokan Alphabet which bears marks of complete development in its orthographic system. The late Mr. T. A. Gopinatha Rao, however, made a futile attempt (vide *Travancore Archaeological Series*, Vol. I, p. 283) to controvert Dr. Burnell and derive the Vaṭṭeḷuttu script from the Brāhmi. His performance, to say the least, is jejune and unconvincing and makes one feel why the writer should have strayed from Iconography into Palæography to so little purpose.

Tamil country at that early time. Western Sanskrists now trace the word *lipi* (letter) to the Achæmenidean *dipi* (edict)[1] and oppose the ascription of the origin of the alphabet to Indian sources on the ground of the absence of any system of picture-writing in India. Though Sanskrit, in spite of the antiquity of its literature cannot furnish this evidence, Tamil takes us to a much anterior stage by the possession of a native word *eḻuttu* (எழுத்து) from *eḻutu* which means *to paint* as well as *to write* according to the context. Whether a system of picture-writing was ever actually followed by the ancestors of the Tamils or not, there can be little doubt that this word itself is a relic of a long-forgotten fact, the filiation of writing with picture and with no other art. This word then takes us to a period immeasurably anterior to any the existing literature can possibly reach. Leaving that apart, these early poems, with all the marks of their primitiveness, still disclose an advanced condition of life and thought, which justifies the conclusion that, even some centuries antecedently the Tamils had emerged from the swaddling clothes of man's first attempt at a settled social polity and culture. But this, however, is a region into which existing literature is unable to throw its rays so as to give us a complete picture. We have to piece together that earlier story from the stray archæological finds that now and then are brought to our notice.

(x) Light thrown on Dravidian Polity and Civilization.

86. An equally interesting question also may be raised regarding the type of civilization to which the Dravidian belongs. It is, no doubt, a vast question and cannot be entered upon here in any detail. If any fact is brought home to our minds by these early poems it is this: that the so-called Aryanisation is a much later phenomenon and was entirely absent from the early generations of the Tables. Even before the arrival of the Aryan colonies in the South, society must

(1) *Vide* Introduction to Dr. A. B. Keith's *Aitareya Āraṇyaka*, p. 23.

have attained politically to the stage of village organisations and popular assemblies and economically it must have been composed of a good number of interdependent professional classes following different handicrafts. We seem to catch glimpses of these village communities at the moment of organising themselves into larger political groups. By a natural development, centralisation of power for military projects, rendered necessary by inter-communal strife, must have led to the establishment of monarchies, which in its turn should have reacted powerfully on social advancement and progress as one could easily see from the outstanding achievements of Karikālan, the Great. Apart from agriculture and trade, which should have fed the economic life of that society, the cultivation of letters and fine arts both by men and women at that early period shows how free and congenial were the social and political conditions then, for it to come to pass. Unhappily Dravidian civilisation as evidenced in these early poems is found mixed up with an exotic culture and even with a barbaric strain due, of course, to the contact of the Tamils with the primitive races. The cattle-raids by the members of the Maḻava community and the wearing of leaves by the damsels of the Kuṟava or hill-tribes, for instance, do not fit in with the advanced culture of the Tamil races as inferable in a manner from this literature. A mere skimming through these ancient records without a power to discriminate between the different strands of a heterogeneous texture they exhibit will give us only a bizarre picture. These must be properly distinguished for a correct understanding of the various strata of that society. Still, however useful this literature may be to give us the *disjecta membra* of a lost culture, we would commit the greatest mistake if we took it for a detailed and exhaustive record of the customs and institutions of that early time. It is just an index and nothing more. As an instance, I shall cite here a stanza from a very old poet, Vanparaṇar, a contemporary of Paraṇar and Kapilar according to the Tables,

which gives us just an inkling and nothing more of the very advanced and highly-elaborated condition of the art and science of music amongst the ancient Tamils:

நள்ளி வாழியோ நள்ளி நள்ளென்
மாலை மருதம் பண்ணிக் காலைக்
கைவழி மருங்கிற் செவ்வழி பண்ணி
வரவெமர் மறந்தன ரதுநீ
புரவுக்கடன் பூண்ட வண்மை யானே.

—*Puṟam.*, S. 149.

Translation: 'Long live Naḷḷi! Oh! Naḷḷi, since you, realising the duties of a patron, have been bestowing the most liberal gifts on the musicians, who are of us (and who frequent thy court), they have taken to sing on the Kaivaḻi (another name for the musical instrument Yāḻ), the *marutam* tune in the darkening eve and the *Cevvaḻi* tune in the morning and have thus forgotten the very system of their ancient art'. The poet implies that by singing the evening tune in the morning and the morning tune in the evening the artists only prove that they have lost touch with the nice technicalities of their art and openly ascribes this scandalous state of matters to Naḷḷi's unbounded munificence. The chieftain's liberality, it would seem, proved a bane to the artists for they had not to depend upon any scientific knowledge and skill in their art for finding a means of livelihood but could afford to do without them being well-assured of a comfortable living by the generosity of their patron Naḷḷi. Making all allowances for the rhetoric employed by the poet, we can yet get at one historical fact through the almost indirect and unconscious testimony his words contain. And it is the very advanced condition of a system of Dravidian musical science and art whose features we have no means of reading in all their details. Its elaborate classification of *Paṇs* and *Tiṟams* and the minute adjustments of these to suit varying environmental conditions and time have all become a thing of the past. If a people at so early a time could take the art of music

to so high a pitch of development, is it not a little hard to assert that the Tamil races of the South were in darkness and that the torch of civilisation had to be brought to them from the North? True, the evidence furnished by the early poems on such points is scrappy and fragmentary; for it was not the purpose of their authors to leave behind them a detailed descriptive account of ancient Tamil culture and civilization. Yet strangely enough some try to equate the life of the ancient Tamil community with this ancient stratum of literature, which is moreover of a type not professedly historical. By a strange fallacy of reasoning they are disposed to view this early literature as possessing signs of the Aryanising efforts in every walk of life in the South. They rely on the occurrence of a few Sanskrit or Prākrit words here and there in the language of this literature and, on that foundation, go to build such astounding propositions as that the whole literature is pervaded by the spirit of Āryan culture and that the entire Dravidian life is also cast in that foreign mould. This, however, is a totally overdrawn picture, nay it is a false one in many of its essential features.

In the first place, the occurrence of foreign words in a language does not and cannot imply the occurrence of large communities of foreigners in the land in which that language is spoken. Migration of words from language to language takes place on a larger scale and at a quicker pace than the migration of a community from one country to another. Unless and until the latter takes place, a community can hardly leave its impress of culture on another less advanced than themselves. Loan words between languages cannot, from their very nature, serve as decisive arguments for establishing cultural transmission in either direction. There are many instances of superior races borrowing a large number of words from the languages of races less advanced than themselves. Will it lie in the mouth of these less advanced backward tribes to proclaim to the world that the mere fact of some of their

own words getting into currency in the languages of the more advanced people is a ground for inferring that the more advanced had borrowed their culture too from the less advanced? I give here this extreme example to prove that words in themselves are not decisive grounds to prove cultural drift. That must be established on independent historic grounds.

Secondly, considering the antiquity of the Dravidian languages and the very imperfect condition of the investigation of their philology at present, dogmatism in respect of certain roots as being exclusively Sanskrit or Dravidian is altogether premature and unsafe. If classical Sanskrit possesses a more copious vocabulary and is richer in roots than the Vedic dialect,[1] it is pertinent to inquire from what source could the later classical tongue have got the large mass of new words. Surely, not from the inner consciousness of the Aryan incomers themselves. They should have borrowed freely from the living languages of the Dravidians and the aboriginal people amongst whom they had come to live. *A priori* reasoning favours the view that later Sanskrit must have taken into its system a large number of roots and words belonging to the primitive Dravidian languages. So, the mere fact that a word or root is found in Sanskrit would not be a sufficient ground to conclude that it is Āryan and not Dravidian. A comparative study alone of all the languages belonging to these groups will throw some light on the matter. And this, obviously, falls within the field of the specialists, where general scholars have little or no right to intrude. And yet, here, we find the amazing spectacle of Philology being

(1) About the loan of Dravidian words to the Vedic dialect itself, I shall quote here a few remarks from Prof. Suniti Kumar Chatterji's work, *The Origin and Development of the Bengali Language*. He writes: "The language of the Rig-Veda is as yet purely Aryan or Indo-European in its forms, structure, and spirit, but its phonetics is already affected by Dravidian; and it has already begun to borrow words from Dravidian (and from Kōl): not only names of objects previously unknown to the Aryans, but also a few words of ideas". Then the writer appends a fairly long list of Dravidian loan-words, which I need not reproduce here and for which the reader may be referred to p. 42 of the introduction to that interesting work.

made the common battle-ground for all and sundry to enter and wage their wars according to their individual predilections and arrive at definite conclusions on points where even specialists would hesitate to dogmatise. But the limitations of even genuine Philology against which Taine inveighs vigorously should make such scholars pause in their profitless pastime.

"Philology," wrote Taine, "is a subterranean passage, dark, narrow and bottomless, along which people crawl instead of walk; so distant from the air and the light that they forget the air and the light, and end by finding satisfactory and natural the smoky rays of the dismal lamp that they trail behind them. After staying there for a few years, they declare that the sky is a dream of the feeble-minded."

Thirdly, the extreme fewness of the Āryan colonists in Tamiḻagam at that time does not favour any such antedating of the Aryanising work. The words of Poet Āvūr Mūlamkiḻār:

"*வேளாப் பார்ப்பான் வாளரந் துமித்த, வளை*"

—*Agam.*, S. 24.

give us a true picture of the pursuits of the early Āryan colonists. We have to infer that there were only two classes of Brahmans then: first, those who performed the Yāgas, and secondly, those who eked out their livelihood by such professions as cutting conch-shells for bangles and the like. If the Āryans then had come in very large colonies, settled in the land and pursued different remunerative occupations, the poet would not have chosen this manner of description. Even at much later times the rulers had to offer special inducements to such settlers by means of land-gifts and other donations to attract larger and larger numbers of

them to the South.[1] But in the course of a few centuries conditions seem to change and a strong and steady current of colonisation afterwards set in. It must have received additional impetus from the invariable policy of the Pallava rulers of still later times, of founding temples and priestly colonies in the Tamil country and bestowing on them extensive tracts of land as *Dēvadāyam* and *Brahmadāyam* for their maintenance. This bit of later history which belongs to the Religious epoch just about the Dēvāram period should not, however, be read back into the life and conditions of the early Tamil society the Tables deal with.

Conclusion.

87. I should not omit to observe in conclusion that while the Tables furnish a time-axis of reference for the facts of ancient Tamil history, the geographical portion of that study, which is as indispensable as the first, still remains to be worked out in detail. All that we do know about a very large number of events recorded in early Tamil literature amounts only to a very general knowledge of their location. Both distance of time and the later fashion of coining new geogra-

(1) "In some of the popular accounts of the Brahmans which have been reduced to writing, it is stated that, during the time of Mayūra Varma of the Kadamba dynasty, some Āndhra Brahmans were brought into South Canara. As a sufficient number of Brahmans were not available for the purpose of the yagams (sacrifices), these Āndhra Brahmans selected a number of families from the non-Brahman castes, made them Brahmans and chose exogamous sept names for them."—Thurston's *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, Introduction, pp. 45-46. And this, be it noted, was the condition of affairs about the middle of the eighth century A.D. Mr. B. Lewis Rice writes in pp. 204-205 of his *Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions*: "According to Sk. 186, there were no Brāhmans in the South in the time of Mukkanni Kadumba, the third century. Having sought diligently for them throughout the region and finding none, he went without delay to the North, and from the Ahichchatra agrahara (said to be in Bareilly District) procured a number of Brahman families. * * *. On the other hand, there must have been some Brahmans before, for the Satavahana grant of the first or second century on the Malavalli pillar (Sk. 263) was made as a Brahman endowment. But they may have left the country, as those above-mentioned from the North are said to have attempted to do. In the East, tradition attributes the introduction of Brahmans to Mukunti Pallava who is also of the third century." If this was so in the border country, the strength of the Brahman element in Tamiḻagam could not then be considerable at all.

phical names in Sanskrit for the Tamil names of early literature render this attempt specially difficult. But difficult as it is, a separate and systematic effort in that direction may lead to fruitful results and go a long way in bringing the facts and events of ancient Tamil history into some sort of concrete connection with one another. Though these Tables assign a specific chronology to such facts and events, still a certain vagueness should cling to them until a more specific and detailed study of their geographical location is entered upon and effected.[1] History, in the absence of correct geography, is rendered half unreal and hence a thorough and extended examination of the geography of ancient Tamilagam from the data available from all authentic sources is doubtless a necessary complement to this study.

(1) The interrelation of historical and geographical studies is tellingly brought out in the following observations:—"This is the significance of Herder's saying that "history is geography set in motion." What is to-day a fact of geography becomes to-morrow a factor of history. The two sciences cannot be held apart without doing violence to both, without dismembering what is a natural, vital whole. All historical problems ought to be studied geographically and all geographic problems, must be studied historically."—E. C. Semple's *Influences of Geographic Environment*, p. 11.

APPENDIX I.

THE DATE OF MANIKKAVACAGAR.

As a striking instance of the omission of literary valuation, I have only to mention here the attempt of certain scholars, whose general historical equipment is beyond doubt, to antedate *Tiruvācagam* of Māṇikkavācagar to the Dēvāra hymns of Appar and Tirugñānasambandar. Leave apart the epigraphic confirmation, which assigns Māṇikkavācagar to the 9th century, the valuation of *Tiruvācagam* on literary grounds alone should have predisposed these scholars to the acceptance of a late date.

I shall here summarise the more important of such grounds: (1) The omission of Māṇikkavācagar from the list of the sixty-three devotees of Śiva enumerated in the *Tiruttoṇḍattokai* of Sundaramūrti, followed closely therein by Nambiāṇḍār Nambi in his *Tiruttoṇḍār Tiruvandāti* and by Sēkkiḻār in his *Periyapurāṇam*, is fatal to any attempt at antedating Māṇikkavācagar. The interpretation of "பொய்யடிமையில்லாத புலவர்" as referring to Māṇikkavācagar has, at all events, nothing to recommend it except its originality. Nowhere else in Tamil literature do we find such a name or descriptive epithet for Māṇikkavācagar. On the other hand, we have literary authority to support that 'பொய்யில் புலவன்' denotes the famous author of *Kuṟaḷ*. An equally original and futile attempt is the interpretation of 'வாசகன்' in Appar's line:

'குடமுழ நந்தீசனை வாசகனுக் கொண்டாய்'

as a reference to Māṇikkavācagar. There is absolutely no authority for holding Māṇikkavācagar as the incarnation of Nandi. Here the word 'வாசகன்' means a 'chamberlain' and no more. (2) In the *Tirumuṟai* collections, *Tiruvācagam* appears only as the eighth in the series, the preceding seven being composed of the hymns of the three Dēvāram hymnists, Gñānasambandar, Appar and Sundaramūrti. (3) In the invocatory stanzas in all Tamil religious works and Purāṇas, composed in praise of the Nāyanmārs and Āchāryas, the authors observe invariably an order which is roughly chronological. Here is a stanza about the work of the various religious teachers in the Tamil country, wherein the arrangement of names follows strict chronology.

"சொற்கோவுந் தோணிபுரத் தோன்றலுமெஞ் சுந்தரனும்
சிற்கோல வாதவூர்த் தேசிகனும்—முற்கோலி
வந்திலரேல் நீறெங்கே மாமறைநூல் தானெங்கே
எந்தைபிரான் ஐந்தெழுத் தெங்கே?"

The praises in honour of the four 'Samaya Kuravars' (Religious devotees or saints) precede those about the four Santānāchāryas (Religious teachers or gurus who come in apostolic succession) and among the four Samaya Kuravars, of whom Māṇikkavācagar is one, Māṇikkavācagar gets only a last mention. And in reciting these religious hymns in the temples all over the South, the invariable practice of reciting *Tiruvācagam* after *Dēvāram* should naturally add its confirmatory evidence to the above testimony.[1] (4) A convention has risen among the Saivites—evidently it must have arisen before the composition of *Tiruvācagam*—that only the hymns of Gñānasambandar, Appar and Sundaramūrti should be known as Tiruneṟittamiḻ. This appellation for a body of religious works does not connote *Tiruvācagam* to this day. If *Tiruvācagam* had been in existence when this name was coined and got into currency, there is absolutely no reason, so far as I know, why it should not have been included in that class. (5) From the point of view of style, *Tiruvācagam* has to its credit more brand-new Sanskrit words than *Dēvāram*. The occurrence of such words as தயா, காபாலி, இடவான், உத்தாரித்து, குப்பாயம், etc., is enough to make us pause before we claim a great antiquity for this work. As for the literary echoisms that occur in *Tiruvācagam*, the jingle "பற்று மற்றெனக் காவ தொன்றினி" and that of "மற்றுப் பற்றெனக் கின்றிநின் திருப் பாதமே" of Sundaramūrti may be considered indecisive; but there can be little doubt that Māṇikkavācagar's 'யாமார்க்குங் குடியல்லோம் யாதுமஞ்சோம்' is a more generalised and therefore a later form in imitation of Appar's line: 'நாமார்க்குங் குடியல்லோம் நமனையஞ்சோம்'. (6) In respect of ideas, *Tiruvācagam* shows considerable development. Both in mythos and philosophical doctrine it marks a highly complicated stage. While the *Dēvāra* hymns are purely religious,

(1) That religious conventions when grown up persist without change and even resist all attempts at modification is borne testimony to by the following observations: "The members of the worshipping group think it strange when the regular order of service is not adhered to. They expect the singing of hymns, the prayer, the anthem by the choir, the announcements, the sermon and whatsoever else they may be, to follow the habitual order and adhere to customary usages".—Frederick Goodrich Henke's *A Study in the Psychology of Ritualism*, p. 87.

Tiruvācagam contains the finished tenets of the Saiva Siddhānta Philosophy. For instance, Māṇikkavācagar's search of a spiritual guru, his query to Siva and Siva's answer about *Sivagñānabōdam* and his philosophical dispute with the Buddhists will bear this out. The verse 'மூவரு மறிகிலர், யாவர் மற்றறிவர்' occurring in *Tiruvācagam* (*Tiruppaḷḷieḻucci*) conveys the sense of the absolute God 'துரிய சிவம்' transcending the Trimūrtis themselves. This conception of godhood was the result of acute philosophising which the Dēvāram singers did not follow, much less preach. They, on the other hand, depict Siva as the God of destruction, who baffled the other two of the triad in their attempt to measure him. (7) Such references as the following occurring in *Tiruvācagam* must argue for a late date:

"மன்னு மாமலை மகேந்திர மதனிற்
சொன்ன வாகமம் தோற்றுவித் தருளியும்."
"மிண்டிய மாயா வாத மென்னுஞ்
சண்ட மாருதஞ் சுழித்தடித் தார்த்த."

The first fixes the post-agamic[1] origin of the work (and the Āgamas, it is well-known, are of very late growth in the religious history of the South), and the second establishes that Sankara's system must have preceded *Tiruvācagam*. (8) There are certain other references in *Tiruvācagam*, which must be taken as pointing to previous Nāyanmārs and certain specific episodes in their lives such as:

"தேனமர் சோலைத் திருவா ரூரின்
ஞானந் தன்னை நல்கிய நன்மையும்."

and

"திருவார் பெருந்துறைச் செல்வ னாகிக்
கருவண் சோதியிற் கரந்த கள்ளமும்."

---

(1) Regarding the agamic or tantric phase of the religious life in India, the observations of H. Kern in his *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, p. 133, will bear reproduction.

"The decline of Buddhism in India from the eighth century downwards nearly coincides with the growing influence of Tantrism and sorcery, which stand to each other in the relation of theory to practice. The development of Tantrism is a feature that Buddhism and Hinduism in their later phases have in common. The object of Hindu Tantrism is the acquisition of wealth, mundane enjoyments, rewards for moral actions, deliverance by worshipping Durga,—the Sakti or Siva-Prajna in the terminology of the Mahāyāna—through the means of spells, muttered prayers, samadhi, offerings, etc." With special reference to the age of the Brahmanical Tantras Hirananda Sāstri, M.A., writes: "The true Brahmanical Tantra books do not appear to be very old. Perhaps they do not go back farther than the 6th century, A.D."—*The Origin and Cult of Tārā* in the Memoirs of the Archæological Survey of India, No. 20, p. 8.

can only refer to Siva's miraculous appearance to bestow *mukti* on his devotee Sundara. Do not some at least of the references in the verses,

"அறுக்கிலேனுடல் துணிபடத் தீப்பும்
கார்கிலேன் திருவருள்வகை யறியேன்."

"தீயில் வீழ்கிலேன் திண்வரை யுருள்கிலேன்
செழுங்கடல் புகுவேனே."

bear upon the tortures inflicted on Saint Appar by the Jains? Do not the lines,

"விருந்தின னாகி வெண்கா டதனிற்
குருந்தின் கீழன் றிருந்த கொள்கையும்"

cryptically refer to the Ciruttondar story? (9) The references in *Tiruvācagam* to many Adiyārs (devotees) and to many miracles performed in many different places show that the work belongs to a late period in the religious history of the South. (10) There is absolutely no ground for the view that the miracle of 'the fox and the horse' was performed for Māṇikkavācagar. There is no allusion in *Tiruvācagam* itself to uphold any such view. Its references are all to previous miracles and not to any contemporary ones, but later on they have been twisted by such Purāṇic writers as the authors of *Vādavūrpurāṇam* and *Tiruviḷaiyāḍalpurāṇam* for adding embellishments to the saint's biography. The usefulness, by the way, of these two Purāṇas for purposes of sober history is yet to be established. (11) Māṇikkavācagar's philosophical disputation with the Buddhists at Chidambaram is only a later and improved edition of Ghānasambandar's religious controversy with the Jains at Madura. Considering the late period in which Chidambaram itself must have come into existence as compared with Madura, the disputation with the Buddhists should also be held as having occurred much later. (12) And finally, the literary finish of *Tiruvācagam*, by itself,—its highly-polished and pellucid diction, its numerous felicities of thought and expression, its marvellously-developed prosodic forms and rhetorical turns and above all the sense of artistry which runs throughout—is more than sufficient to establish its later origin than the Devāra hymns, which as a body, in spite of its higher sacred

character, occupies, from the standpoint of pure literary excellence, only another level in Tamil Devotional Literature. However, this admiration of *Tiruvācagam* should not lead one to claim for it a precedence in time also, as if that alone could ratify and invest its numerous beauties with an additional authority for their being readily accepted.

The cumulative force of these grounds, external, drawn from Tamil religious literature and practice, and internal, drawn from Māṉikkavācagar's own handiwork is enough to convince any fair-minded inquirer that the efforts made to ascribe a high antiquity to *Tiruvācagam* have yet to surmount serious difficulties in that direction.

APPENDIX II.

TOLKAPPIYAM *versus* AGAPPORUL.

I subjoin here for comparison half-a-dozen Sūtras from the two works, *Tolkāppiyam* and *Agapporuḷ*:

Tolkāppiyam.

1. களவியல் 127.
குறையுற வுணர்தன்
முன்னுற வுணர்த
லிருவரு முள்வழி
யவன்வர வுணர்தலென
மதியுடம் படுத்த
லொருமூ வகைத்தே.

2. களவியல் 133.
அல்லகுறிப் படுதலு
மவள்வயி னுரித்தே
யவன்குறி மயங்கிய
வமைவொடு வரினே.

3. களவியல் 130.
குறியெனப் படுவ
திரவினும் பகலினு
மறியத் தோன்று
மாற்ற தென்ப.

4. வேற்றுமையியல் 114.
கிளந்த வல்ல
வேறுபிற தோன்றினுங்
கிளந்தவற் றியலா
னுணர்ந்தனர் கொளலே.

5. வேற்றுமையியல் 174.
அன்புதலைப் பிரிந்த
கிளவி தோன்றிற்
சிறைப்புறங் குறித்தன்
றென்மனார் புலவர்.

Agapporuḷ.

7. முன்னுற வுணர்தல்
குறையுற வுணர்த
லிருவரு முள்வழி
யவன்வர வுணர்தலென்
றம்மூன் றென்ப
தோழிக் குணர்ச்சி.

17. அல்லகுறிப் படுதலு
மவ்வயி னுரித்தே
யவன்வர வறியுங்
குறிப்பி னான.

18. குறியெனப் படுவ
திரவினும் பகலினு
மறியக் கிளந்த
விடமென மொழிப.

59. * *
கிளந்த வல்ல
வேறுபிற தோன்றினுங்
கிளந்தவற் றியலா
னுணர்ந்தனர் கொளலே.

54. * *
அன்புதலைப் பிரிந்த
கிளவி தோன்றிற்
சிறைப்புறங் குறித்தன்
றென்மனார் புலவர்.

6. கற்பியல் 187.
பூப்பின் புறப்பா
டீரறு நாளு
நீத்தகன் றுறையா
ரென்மனார் புலவர்
பரத்தையிற் பிரிந்த
காலை யான.

43. பரத்தையிற் பிரிந்த
கிழவோன் மனைவி
பூப்பின் புறப்பா
டீரறு நாளு
நீத்தகன் றுறைத
லறத்தா றன்றே.

Is it not a little puzzling that *Agapporuḷ*, which lays claim to a divine origin, should thus slavishly copy the terminology of Tolkāppiyam, a work without any odour of inspirational sanctity about it? For it is admitted generally, and by orthodox pandits specially, that Tolkāppiyar being a much earlier author could not have borrowed his language from *Agapporuḷ*. And the possibility of both following a third and common anterior work is entirely out of the question, for none such has ever been alleged to exist. Even creating for the nonce such a hypothetical common original, still it will not save *Agapporuḷ* from the charge of open plagiarism which after all suits ill with its high pretensions to divine descent.

APPENDIX III.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF 'KALITTOGAI'.

The late C. W. Dāmōdaram Pillai, the first Editor of *Kalittogai,* ascribed the whole work to one author, Nallantuvanār, and I find no cogent reason to dissent from his decision. The work itself bears the impress of one artist's execution throughout its five divisions. The syntactical forms employed and the rhythms and rhetorical devices adopted possess a certain family-likeness and point to a common parentage. The numerous references to Madura, to the river Vaigai, and to the Pāṇḍiya king, occurring in all parts of the work, lead me to assume that the author should have belonged, if not to the Madura city, at least to the Madura country on the basin of the Vaigai. I append hereunder some extracts from *Kalittogai* in support of this view.

1. " *ஆனாச்சீர்க் கூடலு ளரும்பவிழ் நறுமுல்லைத்*
தேனார்க்கும் பொழுதெனக் கூறுந ருளராயின்
* * * *
அறல்வாரும் வையையென் றறையுந ருளராயின் "
—*Kali., Pālai,* 30.

2. " *வண்ணவண் டிமிர்ந்தானா வையைவா ருயரெக்கர்த்*
தண்ணருவி நறுமுல்லை
* * *
ற் றிரிதரூஉ நீண்மாடக் கூடலார் "
***Kali., Pālai,* 35.**

3. " *பூந்தண்டார்ப் புலர்சாந்திற் றென்னவ னுயர்கூடல்* "
—*Kali., Kuriñci,* 57.

4. *கனவினாற் சென்றேன் கலிகெழு கூடல்*
வரையுறழ் நீண்மதில் வாய்சூழ்ந்த வையைக்
கரையணி காவி னகத்து.
* * * *
சினையலர் வேம்பின் பொருப்பன் பொருத
முனையரண் போல
* * *
நான்மாடக் கூடன் மகளிரு மைந்தரும் "
—*Kali., Marutam,* 92.

5. " பொருகரை வாய்சூழ்ந்த பூமலி வையை
வருபுன லாடத் தவிர்ந்தேன்
* * * *
பொய்யாவாட் டானைப் புனைகழற்காற் றென்னவன்
வையைப் புதுப்புன லாட.
—*Kali.*, *Marutam*, 98.

6. "புலியொடு வின்னீக்கிப் புகழ்பொறித்த கிளர்கெண்டை
வலியினான் வணக்கிய வாடாச்சீர்த் தென்னவன்
* * *
உருமுறழ் முரசிற் றென்னவற்
கொருமொழி கொள்கவிவ் வுலகுட னெனவே.
—*Kali.*, *Mullai*, 104.

7. " பொருந்தாதார் போர்வல் வழுதிக் கருந்திறை
போலக் கொடுத்தார் தமர்."
—*Kali.*, *Neytal*, 141.

8. " தென்னவற் றெளிந்த தேஎம்போல
வின்னகை யெய்தினை யிழந்த நன்னலனே."
—*Kali.*, *Neytal*, 143.

While the internal testimony of the work bears out the theory of unitary authorship of the poems, later-day scholarship has been busy ferreting out a fugitive stanza like the following:—

" பெருங்கடுங்கோன் பாலை கபிலன் குறிஞ்சி
மருதனிள நாகன் மருத—மருஞ்சோழ
னல்லுத் திரன்முல்லை நல்லந் துவனெய்தல்
கல்விவலார் கண்ட கலி "

and raising on it the untenable hypothesis of a multiplicity of authors for this modest work of 149 stanzas in *Kali* metre. This floating stanza of an unknown author is evidently a late mnemonic verse of facts which require to be proved by tradition instead of the tradition itself being helped any way by the verse. Applying the facts of the Synchronistic Tables one can easily find out that the five authors mentioned in the verse belonged to different generations. They could never have been contemporaries. Such being the case, we have to infer that *Kalittogai* too, like *Pattuppāṭṭu,* is an accretion of a few centuries. The nature of the work does not however permit any such inference. It is surprising that some scholars who follow uncritically the lead of a misleading stanza should have failed to appreciate the artistic unity which runs through the whole of this beautiful work. The attempt to break up this compact artistic structure—the creation of one

master mind—and try to distribute its contents to the credit of various authors[1] almost savours of a touch of Philistinism.

The editor of the new edition of *Kalittogai,* Pandit E. V. Anantarāma Aiyar, has sprung another surprise on us. He suggests an emendation of the good old name நல்லந்துவன் as நவ்வந்துவன். Neither beauty of sound nor facility of pronunciation is improved by the proposed reading. Moreover, the Pandit seems to have missed the delicate phonetic principles which guided the ancient authors in the matter of proper names. Wherever the prefix 'நல்' or 'ந' its shortened form occurred in ancient names, 'ந' always preceded names beginning with a hard consonant, as in நக்கண்ணையார், நக்கீரனார், நப்பசலையார், நப்பாலத்தனார், நச்செள்ளையார், etc., and நல் was invariably used when the names began with a vowel or a soft or medial consonant, as in நல்லுருத்திரன், நல்லிறையனார், நன்னாகனார், நல்விளக்கனார், நல்வெள்ளியார், நல்வேட்டனார், etc. The combination 'நற்சோணை' reveals its late origin; had it come down from the early age it would have reached us not in the form நற்சோணை but as 'நச்சோணை' or நலஞ்சோணை as in நலங்கிள்ளி. This invariable early usage shows that நல்லந்துவனார், as it stands, is a correct form and needs no emendation.

(1) A close study of the five sections of this work discloses throughout numerous repetitions both in thought and diction, sometimes even bordering on mannerism, which cannot but be ascribed to one and one writer only. These I hope to present in a separate booklet.

APPENDIX IV.

NOTE ON 'ARKKADU' AND 'ARUVALAR'.

The popular derivation of the name Ārkkāḍu, to which Dr. Caldwell has given the honour of a mention in his work as ஆர்க்காடு from ஆறுகாடு (Ṣaḍāraṇyam in Sanskrit) is too puerile for serious refutation A more plausible attempt is to connect the name with ஆர், Ār the ātti tree, a variety of ebony (*Bauhinia Tomentosa*). Considering the fact that the Chōḻa kings wore garlands of the *Ātti* flower, as their family emblem, this derivation has at least the semblance of support from an historical fact. But in my opinion this hardly goes to the root of the matter. The names of numerous villages adjoining Arcot on the river Pālār such as Ārkkōṇam, Ārṇi, Ārppākkam require some other explanation. This portion of the country, according to Ptolemy, was inhabited by the Aruvāḷar tribe in the second century A.D. Early Tamil literature calls its two divisions Aruvā and Aruvāvaḍatalai, *i.e.*, Aruvā, North and South. The modern districts of South Arcot, North Arcot and Chingleput may be taken as marking their extent. The people of this tract was evidently the Naga race[1] who seem to have occupied the whole of the northern border extending westwards to the verge of the Arabian Sea. Tamiḻagam was then separated from Dakshiṇāpada or Dekkhan proper of the Aryan colonists by a broad belt of forest land inhabited, in addition to the aboriginal hill tribes and nomads as the Kuṟavars and the Vēḍars, by the Nāga tribes, known as the Aruvāḷars or Kuṟumbars. These last were a thorn on the side of the rulers of the border states of the Tamil land and gave them a 'sea of troubles' by their depredations and frequent forays. The most distinguishing peculiarity of the Nāga tribe was that they lived in fortified places called *Araṇ* (அரண்) in Tamil. References to such fortresses are numerous in the poems we are dealing with. Both *Ār* and *Kuṟumbu* mean fortification in Tamil, probably their earlier signification. (*Cf.* The meanings of அரண், ஆரை, அருப்பம்,

(1) That the name Aruvāḷar was connected with the Nāga race will be evident from the following reference: "Among others Majjhantiko was despatched to Kashmira and Gandhara. A Naga king of that country, named Aravalo endowed with supernatural powers by causing a furious deluge to descend was submerging all the ripened crops in Kashmira and Gandhara."— J. Ferguson's *Tree and Serpent Worship*, p. 47.

all of which are traceable to the root *Ār*). The name 'Aruvāḷar, thus literally denotes the people living in fortified places. Later on the words அருவலர் and குறும்பர்[1] came to signify also people of mischievous or evil propensities; but evidently these later developments in meaning are ascribable to well-known laws of association by which changes in the significance of words are effected in course of time. The Telugu and Kanarese-speaking people even to this day make contemptuous references to *Aravamu,* the Tamil with which they came into contact in the borderland and to *Aravaru,* the Tamil-speaking people. Though the Aruvāḷars spoke a kind of Tamil, it would be a serious blunder both ethnologically and culturally to confound them with the Tamil races living farther South. The Tamils too held these semi-barbarous borderers in great contempt. The following stanza conveys that popular judgment:

> " வடுகர் அருவாளர் வான்கரு நாடர்
> சுடுகாடு பேய் எருமை * *
> குறுகார் அறிவுடை யார்."

Though in Ptolemy's time this portion of the country had come under the Chōḷa rule, he marks the ethnic difference by a separate mention of the Arvarnoi tribes in his account of South India. But as often happens when one race meets another, a fusion seems to have taken place in later times, and the ancient Nāga tribes were also received into the Dravidian society. This Nāga race should not, however, be confounded with the aborigi-nal hill and forest tribes such as the Kuṟavar, the Vēḍar, etc., who still stand lowest in the scale of civilization.

(1) The new Tamil Lexicon gives the following meanings: அருவல் = துன்பம், குறும்பு = விஷமம்.

APPENDIX V.

NOTE ON THE TAMIL SUFFIX *mān* (மான்).

The term Vēḷmān should be properly understood. The ending மான்'should not be confounded with the Sanskrit suffix '*mān*' which found its way into Tamil in later times, as for instance, that occurring in ஸ்ரீமான், புத்திமான், கல்விமான் etc. Vēlmān[1] is one of the earliest formations in the Tamil language, just like Chēramān, Adikamān, Toṇḍaimān, etc., with the suffix *mān* (மான்) which is only a shortened form of the full term '*magan*' (மகன்). The feminine form Vēḷmāḷ is likewise a contraction of Vēḷmagaḷ. In Tamil this word Magan or Magaḷ has two distinct meanings. It means a son or a daughter and also an individual or person in general belonging to a particular Kuḍi (family), or a community formed of a number of such families. This distinction the first Aryan incomers could not understand and thus were led to make a mess of the early literary and linguistic usage by confounding the two significations. The term 'Kēraḷaputra', for instance, remains to this day a puzzle for the Sanskritists to solve. They translated the name literally as "the son of Kēraḷa", which does not make any sense whatever. If they had interpreted the term as the literal translation of a Tamil idiomatic expression Kēraḷar or Chēralar-magan, meaning of course a person belonging to the family or community of Chēralar and then the king or ruler of that community, they would have exactly hit the peculiar connotation. I may instance also the ridiculous attempt to import Persian magis into Tamiḷagam by some European Sanskrit savants in interpreting the simple phrase 'Brahmani Magoi' occurring in Ptolemy's Map of India. There the geographer locates one of the earliest Aryan settlements in the

---

(1) The editor of *Pattuppāṭṭu* in his introduction to that work explains Vēḷmān as வேளிர் தலைவன், the chief of Vēḷir. If the term Vēḷ itself could denote a chief or king, I do not see why *mān* should be made to convey the same meaning over again. Probably he must have taken this suffix as a contraction of the Sanskrit word மஹான். However, the fact that the suffix appearing with Vēḷ takes a feminine form மாள் as in Vēḷmāḷ must render such attempts to connect this form with a Sanskrit original altogether abortive

South at the foot of Mount Malakūṭa[1] in the southern part of the Kanarese country near the source of the Kāviri. He follows the Tamil nomenclature and marks the territory as occupied by Brāhmaṇa Makkaḷ or Mākkaḷ (பிராமணமக்கள் or மாக்கள்) or the Brāhmin community. Thus we find the want of acquaintance with Tamil idiomatic usage has been at the bottom of the whole error.

(1) This name furnishes another instance of the liberties taken with the original Tamil names in the process of Sanskritisation. The Tamil name Kuṭamalai given to the hills of Coorg was literally inverted to give us the Malakūṭa of the Sanskrit authors.

APPENDIX VI.

NOTE ON KARUVUR, THE CHERA CAPITAL.

I have the authority of Dr. Vincent A. Smith and Mr. Kanakasabhai Pillai to identify Tirukkārūr near Kōtamaṅgalam as the ancient Chēra Capital. The controversy started by Pandit R. Raghava Aiyangar, in favour of Karūr, in the Trichinopoly District, is no doubt an elaborate special pleading which is ingenious but not convincing. The fundamental proposition with which the Pandit starts to prove his thesis, that the three Tamil sovereigns were in possession of their several kingdoms in South India since creation, is a piece of dogmatism which few will be prepared to accept. Not only does he not take into account the facts disclosed in the early poems but seems to beg the whole question by representing the various independent chieftains warring against the Tamil kings as rebels pure and simple. He represents the Tamil kings to have been born as it were for ready-made kingdoms to inherit and rule over. Facts of history belie this primary assumption of his. Kingdoms like organisms are born, grow and decay in time and none, with any scientific spirit in him, will hazard the statement that the Tamil kingdoms alone were an exception to the general rule. And, as a matter of fact, what do we find in some of the works we are just now handling? Confining our attention to *Patiṟṟuppattu* alone, the conquest of Pūḻināḍu, of Naḷḷikānam or Koḍagu, of Umbaṟkāḍu or the Elephant country, probably round about the Ānaimalai in South Coimbatore, of Koṅgu country, of Kolli, of Takaḍūr in Salem, of Malayamān-nāḍu on the banks of the river South Peṇṇār in the South Arcot District, follows one after another in the space of four successive generations. The conquest of the Koṅgu country was first begun in the time of Pal-Yānai-Cel-Keḻu Kuṭṭuvan appearing in the fourth generation and takes two generations more for its actual completion. The earlier Chēras appear to have devoted their time to the conquest of the coast strip lying to the west of the Western Ghats and possessing in its south-eastern corner the important key-station, the Coimbatore gap, which alone would give them an entry into the Koṅgu country. Facts of history studied thus along with those of geography must make it clear that the Chēras could by no means have gained a footing in the

Koṅgu country in the period of the earlier generations of the Synchronistic Tables. Koṅgu, however, is easy of approach from the east and south and actually we found the Chōḷa Power in Koṅgu and, in the next generation, a southern power also entering the field. The Koṅgu land was then free from the Chēras rendering it thus an easy prey to be actually overrun by the forces of Āayi Aṇḍiran of the fourth generation. Historical facts such as these embodied in early literature absolutely negative the idea of the Chēra capital being Karūr in the Trichinopoly District—a town of much later growth. Even facts gathered from the mediaeval history contained in *Periyapurāṇam* clearly establish that Coimbatore or Southern Koṅgu was a thick forest infested by marauding tribes with but a few shrines and a sparse population here and there scattered about. It should have been much more so in still earlier times. Had Karūr in Coimbatore been the Chēra capital, surely its adjacent parts would not have been allowed to remain in the primeval state of a forest-covered area, unless, of course, we assume that some sudden cataclysm had swept the Chēras out of existence and allowed those fair regions to be overgrown with thick jungle in the interval. Who would ever subscribe to that view? Taking all these facts into account we are forced to conclude that Coimbatore District at that time was a forest area lying far away from the capital of the Tamil kings and occupied by forest tribes, who had to maintain a constant fight with their more civilized neighbours.

Then again Vañci or Karuvūr, the ancient Chēra capital, should satisfy two primary conditions to render any identification of its site acceptable, *viz.*, that it should stand on the banks of a big navigable river by name Porunai or Ān Porunai and that that river should have Musiṟi, (the modern Cranganore), at its mouth. The following references culled from the ancient poets all point only to one conclusion which goes to strengthen Mr. Kanakasabhai Pillai's identification. Only we shall have to carefully guard ourselves against being mystified by the numerous names under which the river Periyār appears in the ancient texts. It appears as Porunai, Ān-Porunai, Taṇ-Porunai, Cuḷḷiyāṟu, or Periyāṟu.

1. புல்லிலை வஞ்சிப் புறமதி லலைக்கும்
கல்லென் பொருநை மணலினும்.

—*Puṟam.*, S. 381.

2. திருமா வியனகர்க் கருவூர் முன்றுறைத்
தெண்ணீ ருயர்கரைக் குவைஇய
தண்ணான் பொருநை மணலினும் பலவே.

—*Agam.*, S. 93.

3. தண்பொருநைப் புனல்பாயும்
விண்பொருபுகழ் விறல்வஞ்சிப்
பாடல்சான்ற விறல்வேந் தனும்மே.

—*Puram.*, S. 11.

4. சுள்ளியம் பேரியாற்று வெண்ணுரை கலங்க
யவனர் தந்த வினைமாண் நன்கலம்
பொன்னொடு வந்து கறியொடு பெயரும்
வளங்கெழு முசிறி.

—*Agam.*, S. 149.

5. கல்பொரு திரங்கு மல்லற் பேரியாற்று
நீர்வழிப் படூஉம் புணைபோல்.

—*Puram.*, S. 192.

6 நிலந்துநனை யிழிதரு நனந்தலைப் பேரியாற்று
* * * *
செந்நீர்ப் பூசலல்லது
வெம்மை யரிதுநின் னகன்றலை நாடே

—*Patirru.*, S. 28.

7. அருவி யற்ற பெருவறற் காலையு
மருஞ்செலற் பேராற் றிருங்கரை யுடைத்து

—*Patirru.*, S. 43.

8. புனன்மலி பேரியாற் றிழிதந் தாங்கு

—*Patirru.*, S. 88.

The untenability of the identification of this major river of the West Coast with one of the tributaries of the Kāviri, all for the purpose of shifting the location of the ancient Chēra capital to Karuvūr in the Trichinopoly District, is only too patent to need any detailed criticism.

Here I may add that the North-western and the South-eastern boundaries of the ancient Āayi kingdom were marked by the modern Periyār and the Tāmraparṇi respectively. Both these rivers appear then to have gone under the names, Porunai or Taṇ-Porunai or Cuḷḷiyāru. The modern name, Tāmraparṇi, may be traced to ancient Taṇ-Porunai and the river Solen of the Greek Geographer to Cuḷḷiyāṟu of those days. The term Porunai itself, as has been already pointed out in foot-note (1) of page 66, is a part of the fuller name Ān-Porunai, literally the river that

resembles a milch-cow by its perennial supply of milk-like water. This poetic name, I am sure, must have been prevalent from the earliest times when the pastoral tribes over whom the Āayi kings ruled lived in the regions lying between those rivers of the East and the West Coast.

APPENDIX VII.

NOTE ON POET IDAIKKADAR.

Poet Iḍaikkāḍar, like some other poets as Paraṇar, Kapilar and Avvaiyār, has the rare distinction of being made to live again in much later times and play his part for the admiration of a posterity which would not allow him to make his exit from the stage of life. He appears also to have lived when Kuṛaḷ was placed before the Sangam for its approval and to have sung a couplet in praise of that work. By the Tables one can see that this poet belongs to the eighth generation and Kapilar comes between the fourth and the fifth. Thus clearly enough full two generations separate them. Still we find the author of *Tiruvālavāyuḍaiyār Tiruvilaiyādal-purāṇam* asserting positively .

> "முன்னமோர் நாளுன் மாடமதுரையின் முழுதுணர்ந்
> தோன்
> பின்னமில் கபிலன் றோழன் பெயரிடைக் காடனென்
> போன்".
> 20: 1.

Probably some who are determined to stand by all literary texts of by-gone days may be inclined to create another Kapilar to establish this Purānic writer's veracity. But the difficulties which have gathered round the great name of Kapilar can scarcely be tided over by a single such creation. We shall have to requisition at least two more Kapilars to personate the author of *Kuṛiñcipāṭṭu* in the Ten Idylls—leaving out of account the *Kuṛiñci* portions of *Aiyinkuṛunūṛu* and *Kalittogai* for the present—and of *Sivaperumān Tiruvandādi* and the other poems appearing in the eleventh *Tirumuṛai.* Will it be right to give 'a local habitation and a name' to such fictitious authors of the works of later days and take them for historic personalities? Are we to consider for instance Kapilar too as an immortal like Agastya or at least as having lived, more than the ordinary mortal span of years, for some centuries? Or are we to open an arithmetical series like Kapilar I, Kapilar II, Kapilar III, etc., to keep each name apart to its appropriate historical environ-

that alone will lead us to truth. All that I urge here is the necessity of applying to the so-called 'third Sangam' works of Tamil literature such scientific methods of study and interpretation as are now adopted by the Orientalists of the West in the interpretation of the Vedic texts. As in the case of Sanskrit, in Tamil also, a great gap of time divides the later grammarians and commentators from the ancient poets and hence arises the need of scrutinizing thoroughly and with critical insight the deliverances of these later writers.

'man' (மன்).

Taking first Tolkāppiyar's treatment of "*man*' (மன்) , we find him giving three meanings for this particle: (1) கழிவு[1] (condition of being past or past time), (2) ஆக்கம் (becoming), and (3) ஒழியிசை (importing an ellipsis to be supplied according to circumstances). One would like to know how these multicoloured meanings differing from one another in all the categories of time, past, present and future, arose from that simple monosyllabic word '*man*'. Not only are they various, they are even mutually exclusive. The science of Semantics, which occupies itself with a study of the changes in the significance of words, feels certain of its results only when the various meanings associated with a word in its historical development are connected with one another by appropriate bridges erected by logical or psychological laws or by perceivable or conceivable historical accidents. Tolkāppiyar's three meanings stand without any such connection and cannot therefore be held as issuing from one primary root-meaning of the particle. On the other hand, they seem to be based upon extraneous characteristics arising from the different contexts in the sentences in which such a particle occurs.

Moreover, in their application to some of the texts of the ancient poets, these meanings, in spite of their convenient vagueness and generality, are found to fail. Before illustrating this fatal want of correspondence between Tolkāppiyar's meanings and the early texts, it is necessary to clarify one's ideas about 'ஆக்கம்' as conceived by Tolkāppiyar. Iḷampūraṇar illustrates it by 'பண்டு காடுமன்' and Daivaccilaiyār by 'அதுமனெம் பரிசி லாவியர் கோவே'. From such illustrations one must conclude that wherever மன் appears affixed to a குறிப்புவினை

(1) If கழிவு were taken to mean மிகுதி, muchness, it would suit some texts; but none of the commentators has given that interpretation.

(time-less verb, *i.e.*, a noun used as a predicate) it supplies ஆம் or ஆகும் or ஆயிற்று the ஆக்கச்சொல் and completes the formal predication. One can further infer that in cases where '*man*' is affixed to a verb signifying time (தெரிநிலை வினை) the significance of '*man*' should be looked for under either கழிவு or ஒழியிசை. If, however, any were to contend that ஆக்கம் could arise even from a *man*-affixed time-signifying verb, it would really amount to making ஆக்கம் lose its specific force and lead further to the absurdity of every predicate with a '*man*' being twisted to give the meaning of ஆக்கம். It would be, in short, obliterating the distinctions which Tolkāppiyar himself evidently wanted to draw between the various meanings he has assigned. Thus according to the orthodox interpretation, the meaning of ஆக்கம் should not be applied to such texts as the following:

1. *நனிநீ டுழந்தனை மன்னே.*

—*Agam.*, S. 87.

2. *ஆர்குவை மன்னோ வவணமரு களத்தே.*

—*Puram.*, S. 230.

On the other hand, it will be quite appropriate for such texts as:

1. *யாணர் வேனின் மன்னிது.*

—*Agam.*, S. 341.

2. *பசலை மாய்த்த லெளிது மற்றில்லை.*

—*Agam.*, S. 333.

3. *நமர்மன் வாழி தோழி*
** * மலையிறந் தோரே.*

—*Agam.*, S. 241.

The other two meanings being more or less explicit do not require any exposition here. Let me now introduce the reader to the following texts, which cannot be fairly made to take up any of the three meanings specified by Tolkāppiyar:

1. *பீடின் மன்னர் போல*
ஓடுவை மன்னால் வாடைநீ யெமக்கே.

—*Agam.*, S. 125.

2. ** * * நின்*
னூடுகொள் வரிசைக் கொப்பப்
பாடுவன் மன்னாற் பகைவரைக் கடப்பே.

—*Puram.*, S. 53.

3. *அன்னே னன்மை நன்வா யாக*
மனைகெழு பெண்டியா னாகுக மன்னே.

—*Agam.*, S. 203.

4. * * அழிபட ரகல
வருவர் மன்னாற் றோழி
உரைபொடு செல்லு மன்பினர்ப் பெறினே.
—*Agam.*, S. 255.

5. * * * நந்துய
ரறியா மையி னயர்ந்த நெஞ்சமொடு
செல்லு மன்னோ மெல்லம் புலம்பன்.
—*Agam.*, S. 330.

6. அரிமதர் மழைக்கண் கலுழச் செல்வீர்
வருவீ ராகுத லுரைமின் மன்னோ.
Agam., S. 387.

In all these cases, the *man*-affixed verbs being in the future and referring decisively only to future events the meaning of கழிவு is clearly inapplicable. Nor can we say that these time-signifying verbs can express ஆக்கம் consistently with the specific meaning of ஆக்கம் before laid down. And in none of these cases can ஒழியிசை be brought in as there is no ellipsis to be supplied in any of them. Thus one and all the texts quoted above refuse being coaxed to take up any of the three meanings of Tolkāppiyar, simply because these have diverged a good deal from the idea the ancient poets wanted to convey by the use of this particular particle.

A comparative study of the verbs with the *man*-affix opens however a new and fruitful way of interpretation. In the texts of the ancient poets '*man*' served to express 'certainty'. It added emphasis to a predication. It appears with both time-signifying and time-less verbs in all tenses and persons and modifies the predicates to which it is attached as an adverbial adjunct meaning certainly, surely, positively, emphatically.[1] That '*man*' is a particle expressing certainty can also be clearly established from its connection with the verbal root *man*, to exist or persist to exist. Existence being the most authentic standard to measure certainty '*man*' naturally seems to have come to express the new idea. Even in the verbal form it has begun to show signs of this change of meaning.

Take the following line of Kapilar from a *Puṟanāṉūṟu* stanza:

"யானே, பரிசிலன் மன்னு மந்தண னீயே"

(1) I am glad to find that I have been forestalled in this view by Dr. Pope. He expounds '*man*' as a particle of emphasis. Vide '*man*' in the index to his Edition of *Kuṟaḷ*.

Here the relative participle மன்னும் imports not *existence* but *certainty*. Kapilar should be here understood as saying "I am certainly an antaṉan" and not "I am an existing antaṉan" which makes little sense. Following the verbal *'man'* expressing 'certainty', the adverbial particle *'man'* also conveys an identical significance of emphasis. I may also state in this connection that *'man'* does not differ at all in meaning from *'manṟa'* (மன்ற) to which Tolkāppiyar assigns this force of emphasis or certainty. He calls it தேற்றம். Though Tolkāppiyar tries to draw a distinction between *'man'* and *'Manṟa'*, in the usage of the early poets they differ only in quantity and not in meaning. Both import certainty

Examples of *'manṟa'*.

1. கண்டனன் மன்ற சோர்கவென் கண்ணே
Puṟam., S. 261.

2. சென்றோன் மன்றவக் குன்றுகிழ வோனே.
Agam., S. 48.

3. அறனிலன் மன்ற தானே
* * பண்பி றாயே.
Puṟam., S. 336.

4. நோற்றோர் மன்றநின் பகைவர் நின்னொடு.
Puṟam., S. 26.

5. புல்லென் மாலையு மினிது மன்றம்ம
செயிர்தீ ரின்றுணைப் புணர்ந்திசி னோர்க்கே.
—*Agam.*, S. 367.

Examples of *'man'*.

1. சிறியோன் பெறினது சிறந்தன்று மன்னே.
—*Puṟam.*, S. 75.

2. அரிய வல்லம னிகுளை
அறிதலு மறிதிரோ வென்னுநர்ப் பெறினே.
—*Agam.*, S. 8.

3. * * * கானஞ்
சென்றோர் மன்னென விருக்கிற் போர்க்கே.
—*Agam.*, S. 387.

4. செல்லன் மகிழ்நநற் செய்கட னுடையன்மன்.
—*Agam.*, S. 376.

5. வல்லே யென்முக நோக்கி
நல்லை மன்னென நகூஉப்பெயர்ந் தோளே.
—*Agam.*, S. 248.

In these verses the particles '*manṟa*' and '*man*' are both adverbial adjuncts (இடைச்சொல்) denoting certainty and add emphasis and nothing else to the sense of the verbs to which they are attached. The one being a dissyllable and the other a monosyllable does not at all affect their significance. Take again the following lines:—

எமக்கே கலங்க றருமே தானே
தேற லுண்ணு மன்னே நன்று
மின்னான் மன்ற வேந்தே யினியே
நேரா ராரெயின் முற்றி
வாய்மடித் துரறிநீ முந்தென் னானே.

—*Puṟam.*, S. 298.

Here the particles '*man*' and '*manṟa*' are used with verbs in connection with one and the same person and to import the same meaning in exactly identical circumstances. In the face of this stanza how can any one say that these words differ in meaning? In fact, such differences have not been found in these particles; they have been only read into them.

If the reader now tries to apply the meaning suggested here to all the early texts where '*man*' and '*manṟa*' appear affixed to the predicates, he will find how appropriately it suits the contexts and how fully it brings out their meaning. Let me hope that this explication will save future expounders of these ancient poems from the trouble of stretching their texts on the procrustean bed of this particular Sūtra of Tolkāppiyar or of being forced to take refuge in the later canon that '*man*' is a meaningless particle. However much the poems of later Tamil literature are filled with such particles, mere dead shells without the living organism of a meaning inside, the texts of the old poets do not allow me to ascribe meaninglessness so lightly to their words. If we have not understood their meanings, we have to patiently try our best till light dawns on us and not to hasten to bury them in the grave of expletives conveniently dug and kept ready by the grammarians.

'*Kol*' (கொல்)

Turning to the particle '*kol*' we find that Tolkāppiyar's explanation of the term as 'doubt' is but an attempt at an approximate signification and does not help us to correctly interpret many of the ancient texts. No doubt, it seems to hold good in some instances; but the number of cases to which it does not apply is so large that a re-examination of its correctness and applicability to the early texts is imperatively called for.

So far from supporting Tolkāppiyar's meaning a comparative study of the *kol*-affixed verbs supports the conclusion that in the language of the early poets '*kol*' invariably discharged the grammatical function of a question in a sentence. It is a mere question-mark, a syntactical form which has dropped out of later Tamil.

Before offering my proofs for this, I shall, for clearness' sake. arrange the various types of questions occurring in early literature under certain well-defined classes based on the psychological characteristic or background from which all of them proceed. This is all the more necessary since Tolkāppiyar himself has assigned a psychological meaning to '*kol*' as 'doubt'. It rests with the reader then to apply Tolkāppiyar's Sūtra to the various classified instances and see whether it applies to all or any of them or breaks down in the process. The sentences with the *kol*-affixed verbs may be distributed under four distinct classes of questions, which proceed from and correspond to the four mental states of the questioner. They are:—

I. Questions craving for information where the questioner's state of mind is not one of doubt but a blank, a *tabula rasa*. Here the speaker merely seeks for information about matters of which he or she knows nothing or holds no opinion, *e.g.*,

1. என்செய்தான் கொல்லோ விஃதொத்தன்?

—*Kuṟiñcikkali*, S. 24.

2. ஏனோர் மகள்கொ லிவளென விதுப்புற்
றென்னொடு வினவும் * * நெடுந்தகை.

—*Puṟam.*, S. 342.

3. யாங்குச் செய்வாங்கொல்?

—*Naṟ.*, S. 51.

4. அறிவு மொழுக்கமும் யாண்டுணர்ந் தனள்கொல்?

—*Naṟ.*, S. 110.

II. Questions whereby the questioner seeks to resolve certain doubts in his or her mind regarding opinions, beliefs, judgments, conduct, etc., *e.g.*,

1. மகிழ்நன் மாண்குணம் வண்டுகொண் டனகொல்?
வண்டின் மாண்குணம் மகிழ்நன்கொண் டான்கொல்?

—*Aiṅkuṟu.*, S. 90.

2. உண்டுகொ லன்றுகொல் யாதுகொல் மற்றெனா.

—*Naṟ.*, S. 122.

3. அறிவிப் பேங்கொ லறியலங் கொல்லென
விருபாற் பட்ட சூழ்ச்சி.

—*Agam.*, S. 52.

4. கூறுவங் கொல்லோ கூறலங் கொல்லென.

—*Agam.*, S. 198.

III. Questions whereby the questioner desires to secure confirmation of his own views already arrived at in his mind. Here the questioner, so far from expressing a doubt, must be considered to have come to a conclusion in his own mind, affirmative or negative as the case may be, and only tries to enforce it by means of a question. Such questions are expected to elicit either affirmative or negative answers according to circumstances.

(*a*) Questions conveying the affirmative conclusions of the questioner and seeking confirmation by affirmative answers, *e.g.*,

1. தந்தையுங் கொடாஅ னாயின் வந்தோர்
வாய்ப்பட விறுத்த வேணி யாயிடை
வருந்தின்று கொல்லோ தானே பருந்துயிர்த்
* * பணை நல்லூரே ?

—*Puram.*, S. 343.

2. * * நோயா கின்றே
* * * *
இலங்கிலை வெள்வேல் விடலையை
விலங்குமலை யாரிடை நலியுங்கொ லெனவே.

—*Nar.*, S. 305.

3. சேக்கோ ளறையுந் தண்ணுமை
கேட்குநள் கொல்லெனக் கலுழுமென் னெஞ்சே.

—*Agam.*, S. 63.

4. அல்கற் கனவுக்கொ னீகண்டது ?

—*Marutakkali*, S. 25.

5. வாள்வினைக் ககறியா யி னின்றொடு
போயின்று கொல்லோ * *
* இவள் மாமைக் கவினே ?

—*Nar.*, S. 205.

6. மாவா ராதே மாவா ராதே
* * * *
விலங்கிடு பெருமரம் போல
வுலந்தன்று கொல்லவன் மலைந்த மாவே ?

—*Puram.*, S. 273.

(*b*) Questions conveying the negative conclusions of the questioner and seeking confirmation by negative answers.

The positive psychological states mentioned in class III (*a*) and (*b*) and the blank state of class I, preclude doubt of any sort on the part of the speaker, *e.g.*,

1. குளித்துமணற் கொண்ட கல்லா விளமை
யளிதோ தானே யாண்டுண்டு கொல்லோ
பெருமூ தாளரே மாகிய வெமக்கே ?

—*Puram.*, S. 243.

2. பண்டறி யாதீர்போற் படர்கிற்பீர் மற்கொலோ ?
* * * *

கண்டறி யாதேன்போற் கரக்கிற்பேன் மற்கொலோ ?

—*Kuriñcikkali*, S. 3.

3. மழைதுளி மறந்த வங்குடிச் சீறூர்ச்
சேக்குவங் கொல்லோ நெஞ்சே பூப்புனை
* * * *

செறிதொடி முன்கைநங் காதலி
யறிவனுர் நோக்கமும் புலவியு நினைந்தே ?

—*Agam.*, S. 225.

4. பூவொடு துயல்வரு மால்வரை நாடனை
யிரந்தோ ருளர்கொல் தோழி ?

—*Nar.*, S. 225.

5. * * நெடுமா னஞ்சி
தன்னறி யலன்கொ லென்னறி யலன்கொல் ?

—*Puram.*, S. 206.

IV. Merely formal or rhetorical questions whereby the questioner, in moments of heightened feelings such as surprise, grief, fear, etc., allows his language to find vent in the form of a question and thus gives the most effective expression to the then dominant psychic mood. These are questions only in form but really come very near to interjections or exclamations, *e.g.*,

1. இன்சிறு பிண்டம் யாங்குண் டனன்கொல்
* * *

பலரோ டுண்டன் மரீஇ யோனே ?

—*Puram.*, S. 234.

2. ஆசா கெந்தை யாண்டுளன் கொல்லோ
நெஞ்சற வீழ்ந்த புரைமை யோனே ?

—*Puram.*, S. 235.

3. என்னா வதுகொ றானே தெண்ணீர்
*   *   *
ஏமஞ்சால் சிறப்பினிப் பணைநல் லூரே?

—*Puṛam.*, S. 351.

4. என்னாவது கொறானே
* * * *
வினைநவில் யானை பிணிப்ப
வேர்துளங் கினநம் மூருண் மரனே?

—*Puṛam.*, S. 347.

5. என்ன மகன்கொல் தோழி?

—*Naṛ.*, S. 94.

Applying Tolkāppiyar's dictum *re kol* for the interpretation of the various foregoing *kol*-affixed verbs, it seems to serve only in a limited number of instances falling under class II. The idea of doubt cannot be imported into the texts in the other classes without detriment to their plain and natural meanings. Realising this difficulty Pavaṇandi supplemented Tolkāppiyar's meaning by grafting an expletive function too on *kol*. I need scarcely point out that this wonderful meaning of 'meaninglessness' coined by the later grammarian to cut the gordion knot presented by the ancient texts is only a confession of impotence on Pavaṇandi's part to reach the idea of the early poets in the use of 'Kol'. Still allowing that grammarian the benefit of his new device, it will help him only in some cases under classes I, IV and III (*a*), where other interrogative words[1] in the sentence will convey the intended meaning, with *kol* itself expunged as a meaningless particle. In sentences where only *kol* appears without other interrogative words, they will be turned into assertive predications by thus depriving *kol* of its interrogative function. These manipulations however hardly count when we come to the tough cases coming under class III (*b*). In fact, these supply the *instantia crucis* to test the validity of the theory of the Tamil grammarians and of the rival hypothesis herein suggested. Taking the examples 2, 3 and 4 in this class, in all of them the speaker clearly conveys a negative proposition and this can never be effected by construing *kol* either in the light of Tolkāppiyar's dictum of doubt or with

(1) The phenomena of double interrogation, as double demonstratives and double vocatives, etc., have not been treated at all in Tamil grammar. I refrain from entering into this question in detail here, for even without propounding this new theory, the interrogative character of the word *kol* can be fully established.

Pavaṇandi's meaning of 'meaninglessness'. Unless we invest *kol* with an interrogative function, the affirmative character of the predication must remain and thus convey the very opposite of the meaning intended by the speaker. It will be noted that in these cases the speaker enforces the following negative conclusions as:

படீர், காக்கேன், சேக்கேம், இரந்தோரிலர்

and how can this magical transformation of affirmative predicates like

படர்கிற்பீர், காக்கிற்பேன், சேக்குவம், இரந்தோருளர்

be accomplished without assigning an interrogative function to *kol?* When we know that even an assertive sentence may become an interrogatory by the peculiar intonation of the speaker—a device beyond the scope of the written language—cases where the interrogative sentences should import the very opposite of their predication need cause little difficulty.

In short, if the grammarians had laid down a rule stating the interrogative function of *kol* it would have covered all the instances occurring in early literature. Overlooking this fundamental grammatical function, they appear to have gone a little into Psychology and have created an imaginary meaning for the term *kol.* The tabulation of the different types of questions hereabove presented to the reader is enough to show how many and diverse are the psychological attitudes of the speaker which drive him to couch his language in an interrogation. The interpretor of the literary texts is of course bound to read aright the particular psychological state of the questioner's mind for a correct elucidation of the texts. But a grammarian need not entangle himself in such psychological analyses and puzzles and thus miss his plain duty of defining the function and form of a word in the sentence in which it occurs. This perfunctory excursion into Psychology has in fact made the labours of the commentators of the literary works more difficult and arduous. In illustration, I shall transcribe here a few verses from 'ஊர் சூழ்வரி' in *Cilappadikāram* (19:51-59) and the relevant portions of Adiyārkkunallār's commentary thereon:

"பெண்டிரு முண்டுகொல் பெண்டிரு முண்டுகொல்

* * * *

தெய்வமு முண்டுகொல் தெய்வமு முண்டுகொல்?

The commentary runs thus:

கொல்—ஐயம் (In the face of Tolkāppiyar's dictum the commentator could not do anything else. As a grammarian

he does not probe into the exact significance of *kol;* but such an omission does not prevent him from correctly expounding the lines, guided by the true instincts of a literary man). The commentary continues: "கூர்த்த வாளால் என் கொழுநனைத் தவறு செய்தலாற் கோல்கோடிய மன்னனுடைய இக்கூடலென்னு நகரிடத்துப் பெண்டிரும் சான்றோரும் தெய்வமு முண்டோ? உண்டாயின் இவ்வநியாயம் பிறவாது; ஆதலால் இல்லையென்றாளென்க."

It is unnecessary to inquire here why Adiyārkkunallār himself should not have felt the clear contradiction between his almost mechanical reproduction of Tolkāppiyar's meaning 'கொல்-ஐயம்' and the ascription of a negative proposition to the heroine by himself in the closing lines of his commentary. The commentator of *Puṟanānūṟu* too follows the same method in expounding Avvaiyār's line:

இன்றும் பரணன் பாடினன் மற்கொல்.

and while giving the meaning in an affirmative proposition he inconsequentially adds 'கொல்—ஐயம்' in his appended note. So heavy lies the hand of the master on these commentators! As a matter of fact the commentator of *Puṟanānūṟu,* in his interpretation, follows Pavaṇandi and takes *kol* as an expletive.

In the light of this detailed study, the knot presented by the line of the poetess quoted above need not be cut at all by the sharp sword of the grammarian but can be untied quite naturally and so fittingly as to harmonize with the historical necessities brought to light in the Synchronistic Tables. I shall wind up my remarks by inviting attention to the distinction that should be kept in mind about the two meanings that have been assigned here. The meaning of *man* falls under what Dr. Jesperson calls the notional category while that of *kol* is merely syntactical. The former may be traced regularly to its origin in the verbal root *man* whereas *kol,* at present, cannot be so traced. Its relation with the verbal root *kol* is not at all clear and so the origin of this question-mark remains a subject for further investigation.

APPENDIX IX.

NOTE ON THE ELEPHANT-MARKED COINS OF MADURA.

Rev. E. Lōventhal in his work, *The Coins of Tinnevelly*, after referring to the existence of two distinct Pāṇḍya dynasties, one of Korkai and the other of Madura, observes: "Both the chief lines had the elephant and the battle-axe as their royal marks, probably because they were closely related to each other." Early Tamil literature furnishes the most direct testimony on the relation of the two lines of the Pāṇḍiya kings shrewdly arrived at by the reverend gentleman from the valuation of numismatic evidence before him. It confirms his conclusion that the two lines belonged to one family having their original seat at Korkai. In course of time the coin gets an additional fish-mark and Mr. Lōventhal suggests that the elephant and fish-marks symbolize the Buddhistic and the Vaishnavite character of the religious persuasion of the then Pāṇḍiya kings. Whatever may be the significance of the fish, I am inclined to hold that the battle-axe was the original emblem of the Korkai rulers and that the elephant-mark should have been added later on after the conquest of the Āayi country by Pasumpūn-Pāṇḍiyan. It is not at all improbable that the Āayi rulers themselves may have had the elephant-mark as their royal emblem. The Travancore royal house, which now rules over the greater part of the ancient Āayi country, has still the elephant-mark in its crests, with a conch (a symbol of Viṣṇu) placed between and underneath the uplifted trunks of the animals. As to the Āayi kings, it is quite appropriate that they should have assumed this particular elephant-emblem, themselves being the rulers of an extensive mountain region; and the probability of the truth of such an assumption is all the greater if we bring in also the literary evidence bearing on this question. Many are the references in the earliest Tamil poems to the strikingly lavish gifts of elephants bestowed on the poets by the Āayi kings in a manner quite characteristic of their line. Umpaṟkāḍu, the elephant forest, belonged to them at first and came to be annexed to the Chēra dominions later on. Two verses may be quoted here about the elephant-gifts of the Āayi kings:

தீஞ்சுளைப் பலவின் மாமலைக் கிழவ
ஆஅய் யண்டிர னடுபோ ரண்ணை

இரவலர்க் கீத்த யானையிற் கரவின்று
வான மீன்பல் பூப்பி னானா
தொருவழிக் கருவழி யின்றிப்
பெருவெள் ளென்னிற் பிழையாது மன்னே.

—*Puṛam.*, S. 129.

விளங்குமணிக் கொடும்பூ ணாஅய் நின்னாட்
டிளம்பிடி யொருசூல் பத்தீ னும்மோ
நின்னுநின் மலையும் பாடி வருநர்க்
கின்முகங் கரவா துவந்துநீ யளித்த
வண்ணல் யானை யெண்ணிற் கொங்கர்க்
குடகட லோட்டிய ஞான்றைத்
தலைப்பெயர்த் திட்ட வேலினும் பலவே.

Puṛam., S. 130.

These facts fairly make it more than probable that the elephant-mark in the Madura coin symbolises Pasumpūn-Pāṇḍiyan's conquest of the Āayi kingdom. I think such a turning political event as this is more likely to be commemorated in contemporary coinage than the religious persuasion of a king or kings which in fact came to assume importance only after the lapse of four or five centuries from that early date.

APPENDIX X.

NOTE ON THE ARYAS AND 'VADAPULAM'.

The tendency of the human mind to ascribe its own thoughts and feelings to its surrounding objects is a common enough phenomenon and in the matter of reading the ancient history of a country a like tendency impels most of us to project into it our own modes of thought and life and thereby to invert the events from their true historical setting. As an instance of the creation of such false historical perspectives, Dr. A. Berriedale Keith in his work on *Buddhist Philosophy* draws pointed attention to how the advanced idealistic conceptions of the later Mahāyāna system were read back into the earlier Buddhism of the days of its founder. In Tamil literature too this unconscious inversion has been going on for a long time. Conceptions borrowed from such late works as *Cilappadikāram* and *Maṉimēkalai* are generally read back into the poems of the earliest poets with the result that a false picture of the early times is created and believed in. Take for instance the following lines of Paraṇar:

> ிய ரலறத் தாக்கிப் பேரிசைத்
> தொன்றுமுதிர் வடவரை வணங்குவிற் பொறித்து
> வெஞ்சின வேந்தரைப் பிணித்தோன்
> வஞ்சியன்ன.

—*Agam.*, S. 396.

This being one of the earliest references to the Aryans in the group of works we are considering, it must have formed the starting point from which Iḷaṅkō Aḍigaḷ passed on to the Aryan kings of North India and the Himalayas. As an episode in an epic poem it may be allowed; but as an incident in sober history it does not deserve serious notice. Paraṇar's lines should be interpreted strictly as referring to Neḍuñchēralāṭan's victories over certain Āndhra kings of his time who ruled over territories lying just to the north of his kingdom. 'வடவரை' also should be taken as referring to the northern-half of the Western Ghats, known then as Ēḻilmalai. We should not import into these lines meanings historically improbable for that period. Let us take another

couplet:

> வில்லீண்டு குறும்பின் வல்லத்துப் புறமிளை
> யாரியர் படையி னுடைக.
>
> —*Agam.*, S. 336.

The name 'Aryas' here also refers not to the Aryans of North India, but the Aryans nearer home who lived in 'Ariaca' or Ārya-agam lying beyond the northern border of Tamiḻagam. It was then known as 'வடபுலம்' also as in the following lines:

> வடபுல மன்னர் வாட வடல்குறித்
> தின்னா வெம்போ ரியறேர் வழுதி
>
> —*Puram.*, S. 52.

Again in interpreting the name 'வடகுன்றம்' unless there is a clear reference to the Himalayas, the name must be strictly construed as referring to the northern-half of the Western Ghats, beyond the Coimbatore gap. Let us take these verses:

> தென்பவ்வத்து முத்துப்பூண்டு
> வடகுன்றத்துச் சாந்தமுரீஇ.
>
> —*Puram.*, S. 380.

> குமரியம் பெருந்துறை யயிரை மாந்தி
> வடமலைப் பெயர்குவை யாயி னிடையது
> சோழ நன்னாட்டுப் படினே.
>
> —*Puram.*, S. 67.

The reference to sandal-wood in the first verse and the poetic description of the intervening Chōḻa country in the second render the identification of 'வடகுன்றம்' and 'வடமலை' as Ēḻilmalai quite certain and indisputable.

Thus in the interpretation of this earliest stratum of Tamil literature we should be on our guard not to import ideas borrowed from later literature which would not fit into it.

APPENDIX XI.

NUMISMATIC EVIDENCE *re* THE DARK PERIOD IN TAMIL HISTORY (4TH TO 6TH CENTURIES A.D.).

A comparative study of the Pāṇḍiya coins of the early centuries of the Christian era has led Rev. E. Lōventhal to lay down that the coins of the later centuries show considerable debasement. Suggesting that this must have been due to some internal trouble or war, he writes: "I should think the whole series of these coins belonged to the 4th, 5th and 6th century A.D., that is the time when Buddhism and Brahmanism were fighting together." I am, however, inclined to hold that this debasement of coinage should be ascribed more to the political disturbances then prevailing than to any religious cause. The fact is incontestable that from a hundred or a hundred and fifty years from the close of the period of the Synchronistic Tables, *i.e.*, from 300 or 350 A.D., to the beginning of the seventh century there stretches a period of three centuries, whose darkness there is hardly any means of dispelling by our appeal to Tamil literature. The thread of continuous literary development too seems to have snapped with the abrupt close of the dynastic annals arranged and discussed in these Tables. This breach of continuity in the political and literary life of the Tamil people must be attributed to the disturbances to which the once isolated Tamil kingdoms were subjected by the incursions of the growing Pallava power of the North. The loss of independence or at least the necessity of constantly maintaining a fight with a northern rival must naturally have led to the debasement of the coins in the centuries noted, to which Mr. Lōventhal bears valuable testimony.

APPENDIX XII.

Prof. W. F. Clifford on the Authority of Traditions.

Venerable as the Sangam tradition is in the Tamil land, first put into shape by the commentator on *Kaḷaviyal* and then sedulously propagated by later commentators, we have to examine it closely and satisfy ourselves first about its authenticity and secondly about its evidentiary value for purposes of history.

Prof. W. F. Clifford in his paper on the Ethics of Belief emphasizes the necessity of basing belief on a thorough examination of its grounds. And this he claims, be it noted, even for traditions more fundamental and hoary than the tradition we have in respect of the Tamil Sangam. In page 199 of his *Lectures and Essays*, Vol. II, he writes:

"What shall we say of that authority more venerable and august than any individual witness, the time-honoured tradition of the human race? An atmosphere of beliefs and conceptions has been formed by the labours and struggles of our forefathers which enables us to breathe amid the various and complex circumstances of our life. It is around and about us and within us; we cannot think except in the forms and processes of thought which it supplies. Is it possible to doubt and to test it? and if possible, is it right?

"We shall find reason to answer that it is not only possible and right but our bounden duty; that the main purpose of tradition itself is to supply us with the means of asking questions, of testing and inquiring into things; that if we misuse it and take it as a collection of cut and dried statements to be accepted without further inquiry, we are not only injuring ourselves here, but by refusing to do our part towards the building up of the fabric which shall be inherited by our children, we are tending to cut off ourselves and our race from the human line."

If according to the exhortations of this thinker even the traditions that have become the very breath of our nostrils should be subjected to scrutiny, the necessity of the Sangam tradition, which after all is a mere concoction of a literary coterie, being carefully and critically examined goes without saying.

APPENDIX XIII.

Note on *Tiruvaḷḷuvamālai.*

To *Kuṟaḷ*, the great ethico-political treatise of Tiruvaḷḷuvar, is generally appended in its praise a small work of fifty-three stanzas in veṇpā metre from the pen of an unknown author. Suppressing his own name, the real composer of this poetic pendant has chosen to pass it off as the joint-product of the various members of the third Tamil Academy of Madura. Probably fired with an unbounded admiration for *Kuṟaḷ*, the writer may have thought that without this bunch of certificates from the whole Sangam conclave the excellencies of that great work could not be well and truly appreciated by posterity or it may be that, consigning the Sangam celebrities to their proper niches, he wanted to place Tiruvaḷḷuvar on a higher pedestal of his own. Whatever be the motive of the plan and however genuine it may have appeared to an uncritical public, it cannot any longer pass muster in the roll-call of the genuine works of Tamil Literature. The Synchronistic Tables, it is evident, bear hard upon this spurious work. In the light of their facts and their arrangement one cannot resist the conclusion that the account contained in *Tiruvaḷḷuvamālai* is wholly faked and historically of no value. Even as a pure literary production, it is so surcharged with the most fulsome flattery with hardly any ray of critical insight to redeem its verses that one would be justified in severing its connection with the great classic of Tiruvaḷḷuvar. The merits of that masterpiece are admittedly such as not to require this unequal prop.

It is a task of mere supererogation to analyse the contents of this work at any length and lay bare the impossibilities and improbabilities it bristles with. A few significant points bearing on its authenticity may, however, be noted here. The first three stanzas stand ascribed to the unembodied Spirit (அசரீரி), to Sarasvati and to Iṟaiyanār the supreme Lord or God. None in these days will be disposed to seek for authors in such a divine assemblage as this. The human authorship of these pieces, however, peeps out of the last line of the stanza assigned to the Spirit, viz., "என்றதோர் சொல்." Further, the use, in this stanza, of the word 'யாணர்' in the sense of beauty—a very late phenomenon in Tamil Semantics—appears wholly incongruous to the Sangam

age and makes the mysterious spirit quite up-to-date to suit the present-day conditions of the Tamil language. Assuming at any rate that these three stanzas may have been interpolated into a genuine poem on religious motives at a later stage and that their presence should not affect the validity of the rest of the work, one has still to wonder by what mysterious agency could the verses of authors separated from one another by centuries be brought into one work. It is clear that the unknown author has manipulated with the names of the poets belonging to almost all the generations in the Tables and has made them indite verses in praise of one and the same work and in one and the same metric style. What is still more remarkable, he has brought into this company a very large number of much later poets such as Bhāratam-pāḍiya Perundēvanār, Kavisāgara-Perundēvanār, Ciṟumēdāviyār, Kula-patināyanār, etc. The medley thus created could be justified only on such assumptions as these: that the Academy was a continuing living institution throughout some centuries, that *Kuṟaḷ* was submitted to that body during Nariveruttalaiyār's time, *i.e.*, about the second generation, and that all those poets who later on composed stanzas in its praise did so not as Nariveruttalaiyār's contemporaries but as mere slavish imitators of an ancient model traditionally handed down to them. If such were the case, this modest work of 53 stanzas should be considered like Homer or the *Mahabhā-rata*, a miniature epic of growth!

My only excuse for going into this length of criticism is the amazing seriousness with which such spurious compositions are treated in our current histories of literature.

APPENDIX XIV.

NOTE ON THE NAME 'Tirumurugārṟuppaḍai'.

The very name 'Tirumurugarṟuppaḍai' proclaims its late origin involving as it does a new turn in the use of the phrase ஆற்றுப்படை and quite a departure from the linguistic practice of the early poets. To these latter the phrase stood for a species of literary composition wherein the poet points out a way to be pursued by certain individuals addressed by him, for gaining their particular objects. Thus பொருநராற்றுப்படை, பாணாற்றுப்படை (both major and minor), and கூத்தராற்றுப்படை (otherwise known as Malaipaḍukaḍām) all signified compositions wherein the Porunar, Pāṇar and Kūttar are each directed to pursue certain paths to attain certain ends of theirs. Interpreted according to this time-honoured literary usage 'Tirumurugārṟuppaḍai' should denote a composition by which the poet directs Tirumurugan to follow a certain path to compass some of his ends. But that evidently is not the idea of this late poet, as the work itself shows. Here he is seen to direct the devotee to reach Murugan in his various shrines, worship him and thereby get salvation. This undoubtedly involves a departure from the established literary usage—a departure which none of the old poets would have perpetrated. To strengthen my contention I shall refer the reader to the use of this identical phrase by an old poetess, Veṟi-pāḍiya-Kāmakkaṇṇiyar, in the line:

"முருகாற்றுப் படுத்த வுருகெழு நடுநாள்."

Agam., S. 22.

Here the phrase means, as it should, that God Murugan had been brought to the heroine's home for worship. The transitive verb படுத்த and the verbal noun derived from it படை appearing in the compounds ஆற்றுப்படுத்த and ஆற்றுப்படை were always used then with their grammatical objects. The names of all the old Āṟṟuppaḍai poems fall in line with this early usage. But in *Tirumurugāṟṟuppaḍai,* this usage has been wholly departed from and a new extension effected. Probably this may be a sign of growth of thought and facility in the use of the linguistic instrument but that means the lapse of an appreciable time for it to come to pass.

APPENDIX XV.

The Age of *Tolkāppiyam*.

In the cloistered world of Tamil learning, the age of *Tolkāppiyam* stands to this day an insoluble problem. Not that the problem itself is really insoluble, but it has been made to appear so by powerful influences, racial, religious, literary, and even sentimental, which have gathered round this particular work and thrown up such entrenchments as cannot be carried by mere literary men. Tradition and dogmatic opinion have been responsible for the widely-entertained belief that *Tolkāppiyam* alone of the existing works in Tamil belongs to an anterior stratum, the so-called 'Second Sangam Literature', and that it is far too much older than *Puṟanāṉūṟu, Agaṉāṉūṟu,* etc., which are relegated to a special class, the 'Third Sangam Classics'. This rooted conviction has been further stiffened by the writings of some of the learned commentators of *Tolkāppiyam,* who, despising the use of centuries for measuring the age of this unique work, have launched into æons and *ūḻis* instead —an *ūḻi* of course taking in that vast stretch of time which intervenes between the creation of a cosmos and its destruction. Even such practically inconceivable periods of time as are dealt with by the Geologists dwindle into insignificance before the actual time-measure adopted by these authors in settling a problem in Tamil literary history! Such a thoroughly unscientific attitude and procedure are possible only in a field of study self-centred and stagnant and absolutely cut off from the vitalizing currents of modern thought and modern methods.

Taking *Tolkāppiyam* out of this privileged position and subjecting it as any other work to a critical examination from every point of view open to a linguist, a literary man or a historian, one will find that its transcendent antiquity is a pure myth and that its relative age in Tamil literary history can easily be settled. The assigning of this work absolutely to a particular century may not be feasible at present, for its composition quite probably falls within the dark period of Tamil history just preceding the advent of the Religious epoch; but to fix its age relatively to some of the third Sangam works, such as *Puṟanāṉūṟu,* etc., is, it seems to me, not at all difficult. The linguistic evidence I have thus far gathered in my study of Tolkāppiyar's treatment of 'uriccol' warrants

the conclusion that the composition of this grammar comes much later and is separated from the *Puṟanāṉūṟu* period by a fairly wide gap of time. Reserving the results of that study for a separate treatment I shall here confine myself to a discussion of only those points on which the Synchronistic Tables throw an altogether new and much-needed light.

I shall summarize them under five heads:

(1) The first mention of Vēṅkaṭam in this literature occurs in the poems of Kallāḍanār, a poet of the seventh generation. It was in the sixth generation that Aruvānāḍu was conquered and brought under complete subjection by Karikālan II. Both the father and the grandfather of this sovereign are said to have fought some battles in the North; but those victories did not take them as far north as Vēṅkaṭam nor did they lead to any permanent occupation of territory in that region. It was only during the time of the great warrior-king Karikālan II that the Chōḻa kingdom had its northern frontier pushed to the foot of Vēṅkaṭam. If this fact of early Chōḻa history is admitted—and existing literature does not permit one to ante-date the conquest of North Aruvānāḍu in pre-Karikālan days—it gives us an important *point d' appui* for the settlement of Tolkāppiyar's age. In the commendatory stanza composed by Panampāranār, Tolkāppiyar's co-student according to tradition, and prefixed to *Tolkāppiyam* it is definitely stated that Vēṅkaṭam was the northernmost boundary of Tamiḻagam at the time of the composition of that work. Hence one may legitimately infer that Tolkāppiyar could not have written his grammar before the Chōḻa power had extended its conquests to the foot of that northern hill. Surely when the country round about Vēṅkaṭam was a region of thickly-grown forests infested with marauding tribes under their chieftain Pulli none would be warranted in assuming that that region had come under the civilized rule of the Chōḻas. It was only after the complete subjugation of the Aruvānāḍu of the Naga tribes and of the North Aruvā inhabited by some forest-tribes and the planting of Tamil colonies in those semi-civilized and barbarous regions that Vēṅkaṭam must be considered to have become the northernmost boundary of the Chōḻa dominion and hence of Tamiḻagam. This bit of political history testified to by the Tables about the gradual expansion of the Chōḻa power is entirely subversive of the current view *re* the composition of *Tolkāppiyam* in the pre-Puṟanāṉūṟu period. In the light of the early conditions it is simply unthinkable.

(2) If these Tables establish any historical fact beyond a doubt it is this: that the rulers of the three royal dynasties of the Tamils were engaged in an unceasing and protracted warfare with many a tribal ruler for the expansion of the very limited territories with which they seem to have started. Before the establishment of their capitals at Uṟaiyūr, Karuvūr and Kūḍal they could not be considered as having attained the status of 'Great Kings', a status which their descendants came to occupy in later times as could well be gathered from the narrations in later literature. Supposing that *Tolkāppiyam* had preceded the establishment of the three Tamil monarchies in their respective capitals, would such Sūtras as the following appear in it?

(*a*) போந்தை வேம்பே யாரென வரூஉ
மாபெருந் தானையர் மலைந்த பூவும்.

—*Agattiṉai-Iyal.*, S. 60.

(*b*) படையுங் கொடியும் * *
தாரு முடியு நேர்வன பிறவுந்
* செங்கோ லரசர்க் குரிய."

—*Marapu-Iyal.*, S. 626.

(*c*) வண்புகழ் மூவர் தண்பொழில் வரைப்பி
னாற்பெய ரெல்லை யகத்தவர் வழங்கும்.

—*Seyyuḷ-Iyal.*, S. 391.

Such descriptions as 'மாபெருந்தானையர்' 'முடி......செங் கோலரசர்' and 'வண்புகழ் மூவர்', applicable to the time of the fully-developed Tamil kingships would scarcely suit the early period when these were only in the making and just feeling their way towards territorial expansion, dominant power and political influence. How could the early communal Vēḷs and Kō's be styled மாபெருந்தானையர், the kings with big standing armies? How could they be invested with the crown and sceptre, the insignia of full-fledged royalty of later days? How could Veḷiyan Tittan and his son Tittan Veḷiyan, the first two Chōḷa sovereigns in the Tables, who ruled their people without wearing a crown, be brought under the description of Tolkāppiyar? How could the general phrase 'three kings' refer particularly to the Tamil kings at a time when there were seven kings, eleven kings, and host of them besides, in a proper counting? Again, the political division to which the third extract refers is not at all applicable to the period of the Synchronistic Tables. The commentator rightly expounds that it comprised the four major political provinces of the Tamiḻagam of Tolkāppiyar's days, *viz.*, Pāṇḍiyamaṇḍalam,

Malaimaṇḍalam, Chōḻamaṇḍalam and Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam. Now a reference to Toṇḍaimān Iḷantiraiyan occurs only in the time of Avvaiyār of the ninth generation and from this one cannot immediately jump to the conclusion that there was a political province under the name Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam in those days, for this name itself was brought into vogue at a much later date. Even after the conquest and colonisation of the Aruvānāḍu, North and South, the territory must have existed only as part and parcel of the Chōḻa kingdom. After a century or two from the time of Karikālan II this northern dependency seems to have become a separate principality (the Kaḷabhra interregnum testifies to this effect), which in still later times became the *nidus* for the Pallava power to grow in. In time, this new power grew to such dimensions that it easily subverted the paramount Chōḻa rule and overran the other Tamil States too. But all these belong to much later history. What we have to note in this connection is that the four-fold political division to which Tolkāppiyar alludes in his Sūtra is the picture of a later Tamiḻagam which we have no right to project into the times of the dynastic kings appearing in the Synchronistic Tables. Tolkāppiyar's reference must be strictly construed as mirroring the conditions of a much later period in the political history of the Tamils.

(3) We have seen from the Tables that the few Aryans who first came into the Tamil country were of the religious order and had been invited by Karikālan II and Muduku̇ḍumi Peruvaḻudi for the performance of Yāgas. There was a small sprinkling of secular Brāhmans also who pursued some handicraft work or other. This handful of immigrants from the North could hardly have exerted any influence on the politics of those days. By the fewness of their numbers, by the inconspicuousness of their professions, by the absence of the fighting Kṣatrya element in their ranks, and, above all, by the war-like propensities of the Tamil kings themselves, the early Aryan settlers could not certainly have borne any part or lot in the political life of Tamiḻagam then; much less could they have cast a glance towards the occupation of a throne. And yet we find in Tolkāppiyar, a Sūtra like this:

"*அந்தணாளர்க் கரசுவரை வின்றே.*"

—*Marapu-Iyal*, S. 637.

Howsoever applicable this dictum may be to North India or to South India in much later times, it has no relevancy to the political conditions of the ancient Tamil States during the first

two centuries of the Christian era and presumably much less to any century preceding them. If *Tolkāppiyam* is a work composed for the Tamils, their language, and their country, this particular Sūtra should then be construed as the product of a much later literary activity when the Aryan element gained in strength, influence and importance in the Tamil land.

(4) Let us take another Sūtra:

"மாயோன் மேய காடுறை யுலகமும்
சேயோன் மேய மைவரை யுலகமும்
வேந்தன் மேய தீம்புன லுலகமும்
வருணன் மேய பெருமண லுலகமும்."

—*Agattiṇai-Iyal*, S. 5.

Applied to the four fundamental works of these Tables and even in the case of the secondary works much of this description must lack in pertinency. The occurrence of the names மால் and இந்திரன் in a few stanzas in a body of poems numbering above 1,600 can in no way be construed as importing a classification of the land amongst the different deities specified by Tolkāppiyar—a novel scheme, be it noted, that was sought to be grafted on the life and literature of the early Tamils by a later systematism just about the dawn of the Religious epoch. To one conversant with the method of linguistic development and literary forms the very scholasticism which breathes through this classification of the land and a tabulation of its products, and its people with their modes of life, manners, etc., should proclaim itself as an aftergrowth, such a scheme being incompatible with the creative period of a nation's literature dealt with in the Synchronistic Tables. Still, those who cherish the antiquity of *Tolkāppiyam* as an article of faith may seek to press into service the mere mention of the names of some deities in early literature as affording a clear testimony to the state of popular belief in such deities at that time and also to the literary usage of investing such deities with the presiding functions in their respective *locale*. Allowing the fullest scope even for this latitudinarian interpretation, how can they grapple with the difficulty raised by Tolkāppiyar's specific mention of Varuṇa? Not even a single poet has alluded, anywhere, or on any occasion, to this particular deity either by name or by implication. This leaves us in little doubt that Tolkāppiyar's reference must be shifted to much later times for coming into some accordance with prevalent literature. It will not certainly be relevant to raise in this connection any question about Varuṇa's antiquity in the

Aryan pantheon. Admitting that that antiquity reaches the Rig Vedic Period, or even a still earlier age, what is here urged is the lateness of its introduction into the pantheon of the Tamils. If *Tolkāppiyam* had preceded the basic works of the Tables and served as their authority, there is not the least reason why one and all the poets who allude to such deities as ஆலமர்க்கடவுள், முருகன், நடுகற்றெய்வம், கள்ளிநீழற் கடவுள், etc., should have given the go-by to this particular deity in their stanzas. If Varuṇa had been as familiar to the early Tamils as to Tolkāppiyar, surely a few poets at least would have alluded to him in some stanza or other. This allusion to Varuṇa therefore definitely throws the composition of *Tolkāppiyam* to a much later age when the major portion, if not the whole, of the Aryan pantheon was systematically introduced into the Tamil country, taking of course into its bosom a number of pre-Aryan deities. As for the method adopted for the effective assimilation in religion, the following lines of *Paripāḍal*, a late work, furnish the most instructive and interesting information:

"அழல்புரை குழைகொழு நிழறரும் பலசினை
யாலமுங் கடம்பு நல்யாற்று நடுவுங்
கால்வழக் கறுநிலைக் குன்றமும் பிறவு
மவ்வவை மேய வேறுவேறு பெயரோ
யெவ்வயி னோயு நீயே."

—*Paripāḍal*, 4: 66-70.

Here the poet exhibits an extraordinary catholicism capacious enough to absorb every form of worship, then obtaining in the Tamil land, into the cult of Viṣṇu. 'Māyōn' occupying the place of honour in Tolkāppiyar's Sūtra quoted above, it is but reasonable to hold that that grammatical work is much nearer to the period of *Paripāḍal* than to the earlier works, *Puṟanānūṟu, Aganānūṟu*, etc.

(5) We have seen that the Synchronistic Tables comprise events which fall within the first two centuries of the Christian era and will not fit in if shifted to any subsequent period. That fact being established, the following Sūtra of *Tolkāppiyam* supplies us with the most valuable testimony of a definite chronological significance. It runs:

"மறைந்த வொழுக்கத் தோரையு நாளுந்
துறந்த வொழுக்கங் கிழவோர்க் கில்லை."

—*Kaḷaviyal.*, S. 135.

The word 'ஓரை' in this Sūtra has a history of its own and enables us to determine the upper limit of Tolkāppiyar's age

with some degree of certainty. 'ஓரை' is certainly not a Tamil word by its origin; nor is it native even in Sanskrit before the Astronomers of the North borrowed it from the Greeks. The opinion of Western Orientalists like Colebrooke, Weber, Whitney, Thibaut, Jacobi and Keith is unanimous about at least the later Indian Astronomy having been decisively influenced by the Greek Science. G. R. Kaye in his valuable contribution on Hindu Astronomy, published in the Memoirs of the Archæological Survey of India No. 18, has clearly demonstrated that the Vedic and the post-Vedic periods down to the first century of the Christian era mark the existence of the Indian Astronomy, as an entirely indigenous system free from foreign influence of any kind. Coming, however, to the third stratum of that Science which synchronises with the period of the Gupta dynasty from 320 A.D. to 650 A.D., he pronounces it as being largely permeated by Greek method and thought. Aryabhaṭa born towards the close of the fifth century and Varāhamihira of the sixth century were the earliest Astronomers who absorbed the new influence of the West and borrowed also a good number of Greek technical terms of which 'Hora' is one. If Sanskrit language itself cannot claim possession of this particular word before the Gupta period or the fifth century approximately, how can Tolkāppiyar who borrowed the word from Sanskrit—and few, I think, will contend that he borrowed it direct from the Greek source for his grammatical work—aspire to any higher antiquity?

A treatment of the linguistic evidences from *Tolkāppiyam* itself may be reserved for another occasion, as it will swell this Appendix beyond its acceptable limit.

Reasons like the foregoing drawn from historical facts and probabilities may not appeal to those who are used to take a static view of history wherefrom the time-element is wholly extruded. Whether from a desire to glorify the past or from an incapacity to shake off erroneous ideas in estimating that past or from an unwillingness to get out of traditional grooves of thought, they generally transport *en masse* the latest developments in any walk of life and thought to any anterior period in history, without the least notion of the monstrous inversion they thereby make. Among such there may still be many hardy Jasons to go in search of the golden fleece of Tolkāppiyar's Date in pre-Christian centuries or even millennia and who can hope to dissuade them from that heroic venture?

Turning, however, to the side of serious inquiry, we find that the Synchronistic Tables open a fair and fruitful way of solving

the problem of Tolkāppiyar's Date. They restore the ancient classical poems of Tamil to their rightful place of priority as against *Tolkāppiyam* by establishing that a good many of them are almost contemporary with the birth of the Tamil monarchies. No sooner have the facts of early Tamil history, hitherto chaotically jumbled up and rendered irrational and even mute, been arranged in a time-scheme in their natural order of sequence than they have acquired a new intelligibility and significance and give us a most valuable and much-needed guidance in interpreting the facts of the political and social life of the Tamils no less than those of their language and literature. If the basic works of the Tables do not enable us to fix Tolkāppiyar's date absolutely in a particular century, at least they leave us in little doubt about the relative age of his work as compared with themselves. This in itself is a great point scored in favour of a correct reading of the history of Tamil language and literature. Hitherto the traditional practice unquestioningly followed of ante-dating *Tolkāppiyam* and post-dating the third Sangam classics has only thrown inquiry wholly off its right track. Instead of the earlier Sangam works supplying the norm for the valuation of *Tolkāppiyam,* this comparatively late grammar was erected into an absolute standard by which those ancient poems were invariably measured and judged. The viciousness of this practice is solely due to the inverted and false chronology on which it is based. And it is to the entire reversal of this faulty method that the Synchronistic Tables supply a most valuable help.

INDEX.

[Figures in heavy types refer to the number of the verse quoted from the particular Sangam Collection under which they appear.]

A

Aayi, 79, 106, 110, 122, 164, 168, 169, 170, 249.
Aayi Āṇḍiran, 105, 106, 118, 164, 170, 232.
Aayi Atiyan, 123, 125, 164, 170.
Aayi country or kingdom, 81, 123, 132, 133, 147, 163, 164, 165, 167, 169, 170, 187, 233, 249, 250.
Aayi Eyinan, 78.
Aayi Family, 123, 124, 163, 171, Kings, 113, 114, 115, 116, 121, 122, 125, 163, 166, 167, Tribe, 106, 168, 169, 170, 171, 234, 249.
Aayi Titiyan, 118, 163, 164, 167, 170.
Aayi Titiyan II, 167.
Academy, 20, 22, 23, 24, 28, 197, 198, 256.
Achāryas, 217.
Achæmenidean *dipi*, 209.
Adarima Koreour, 74, 106.
Adikamān, 229.
Adiśēṣa, 105.
Adiyamān Neḍumān Añci, 153, 155, 157.
Adiyamān Kōḷiyūr, 106.
Adiyamān Pōkuṭṭeḷini, 157.
Adiyan, 106.
Adiyārkkunallār, 125, 247, 248.
Aḍiyārs, 220.
Āḍoṇḍai-Cakravartī, 154.
Āḍukōṭpāṭṭu Chēralātan, 136, 137, 138, 139.
Āgamas, 219.
Agaṇāṉūṟu or *Agam.*, 12, 15, 28, 29, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38, 41, 68, 71, 89, 110, 116, 152, 198, 199, 208, 258, 263.
30, 31, 43, 45, 62, 70, 75, 76, 78, 79, 80, 82, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104, 114, 118, 121, 122, 123, 124, 146, 150, 153, 154, 155, 158, 174, 180, 181, 214, 233, 239, 240, 241, 244, 245, 251, 252, 257.
6-75; **8**-241; **22**-257; **24**-214; **25**-114; **26**-152; **36**-146; **42**-101; **44**-78, 89, 174; **48**-241; **52**-244; **63**-244; **65**-103; **76**-99; **85**-154; **87**-239; **93**-233; **96**-96; **115**-82; **116**-103; **122**-70, **125**-94, 239; **137**-70; **142**-79; **149**-180, 233; **152**-180; **153**-80; **162**-123; **168**-104; **186**-76; **196**-95; **198**-244; **203**-239; **206**-68; **208**-79; **211**-158; **216**-150; **220**-80; **225**-245; **226**-80; **227**-181; **241**-239; **246**-93, 95; **248**-241; **253**-121, 124; **255**-240; **266**-62, 122; **296**-100; **322**-118; **323**-116; **326**-76; **330**-240; **333**-239; **336**-97, 252; **338**-97, 121; **340**-154; **341**-239; **346**-153; **352**-155; **356**-97; **367**-241; **375**-97; **376**-241; **387**-240, 241; **396**-79, 251.
Agapporuḷ, or *Iṟaiyanār Agapporuḷ* 19, 20, 24, 105, 196, 197, 222, 223.
7-222; **17**-222; **18**-222; **43**-223; **54**-222; **59**-222.
Agastiyarkūḍam, 77.
Agastya, 105, 117, 235.
Agastya in the Tamil Land, 9, 78.
Agattiṇai-Iyal, 260, 262; **5**-262; **60**-260.
Agattiyam, 23.
Agattiyanār, 24.
Augustus Cæsar, 185.
Age of Tirugñanasambandha, 195.
Agricultural Tribes, 66.
Augustus, 117.
Ainkuṟunūṟu, 15, 28, 29, 30, 33, 36, 37, 41, 44, 101, 189, 199, 208, 235, 243; **90**-243; **467**-101.
Aioi, 175, Country, 163.
Aitareya Āraṇyaka, 209.
Aiyūr, 150, 152.
Aiyūr Muḍavanār, 150.

Aiyūr Mūlamkiḻār, 155.
Akkadians, 206.
Akṣapāda, 129.
Akutai, 72, 96, 97, 98, 99, 107, 108, 122.
Aḻagiyapaṇḍiyan, 122.
Aḻagiyapaṇḍiyapuram, 122.
Ālattūr Kiḻar, 143, 147.
Alexandrian Massacre, 179, 183, 184, 185, 186.
Alikasudra, 168.
Aḻisi, 39, 63, 64, 68, 69.
Aḻisikāḍu, 63.
Aḻumbil, 89.
Aḻumbūr, 89.
Aḻundai, 89.
Aḻundūr, 88, 89, 95, 98.
Aḻuntūrvēḷ, 67.
Ambar Kiḻān Aruvandai, 147.
Ammūvanār, 30, 32, 118.
Āmūr, 74, 75.
Ānaimalai, 117, 231.
Anantarāma Aiyar, Pandit E. V., 226.
Añci, 118, 153, 154, 158.
Añcil Āntai, 155.
Ancient India, 182, 184.
Ancient Tamiḻagam, 163, 168.
Ancient Tamil History, 164.
Anderson, J. D., 84.
Āndhra, 177, Brahmins, 215, Dynasty, 176, Kings, 251.
Aṇḍiran, 106.
Aṇilāḍumunṟil, 39.
Anilāḍumunṟilār, 39.
Annals, 180.
Anni Migñili, 95.
Ān-Porunai, 66, 232, 233.
An-ta-lo, 177.
Antoninus Pius, 185.
Antuvan Chēral, 83, 85, 86, 87, 103, 106, 138.
Aparāntika, 176.
Appar, 217, 218, 220.
Arabian Sea, 118, 121, 227.
Araṇ, 227.
Aravalo, 227.
Aravamu, 228.
Archæological Department of Mysore, 6.
Arcot, 14, 62, 70, 71, 73, 89, 136, 140, 173, 227, 231.
Ariaca, 175, 176, 252.
Ariake Sadinon, 176.
Arimaṇavāyilnāḍu, 62.
Arisil Kiḻār, 124, 128, 197.
Aristotle, 23.
Aṟivuḍai Nambi, 53, 156, 158.
Āriyappaḍai-Kaḍanta - Neḍuñcēḻiyan, 158.
Ārkkāḍu, 62, 63, 68, 69, 70, 175, 196, 227.
Ārkkāṭṭu Kiḻar, 196.
Ārkkōṇam, 227.
Ārṇi, 227.
Arouvarnoi, 173, 228.
Ārppākkam, 227.
Āṟṟuppaḍai, 257.
Aruvāḷar, 62, 63, 82, 94, 140, 173, 227, 228.
Aruvānāḍu, 227, 259, 261.
Aruvāvaḍatalai, 227.
Ārya-agam, 176, 252.
Aryabhaṭa, 264.
Aryan, 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 12, 13, 22, 23, 89, 135, 176, 187, 196, 205, 209, 213, 214, 229, 251, 252, 259, 261, 262, 263; Civilisation, 207, 212; Colonists, 214, 227; Community, 4, 25; Kings, 111, 117, 176, 251; Literature; 11, Religion, 131.
Aryanisation, 4, 10, 13, 39, 196, 209.
Asoka, 14, 62, 168, 169, 170, 193, 206, 208.
Asoka's Edicts, 14, 168, 169.
Ātan, 39.
Ātan Avini, 158.
Ātan Eḻini, 147, 150.
Atikan, 79.
Ātimanti, 93.
Atiyamān, 170.
Atiyan, 78, 79, 122, 123, 124, 147, 170.
Atiyar Family, 125.
Atiyarmā, 74.
Atiyarmagan, 170.
Atiyarmān Kōḷiyūr, 74.
Āṭṭan Atti, 93.
Atti, 63, 78, 85, 93, 142, 175, 227, 228.
Āṭukōḷ, 139.
Āṭukōṭpāṭṭu Chēralātan, 132, 136, 137, 138, 139.
Augustus, 117.
Avalōkitēsvara, 25.
Āvūr, 150.
Āvūr Mūlam Kiḻār, 155, 214.
Avvaiyār, 151, 153, 154, 155, 158, 161, 235, 236, 237, 261.
Āyar, 64, 82, 106, 169.
Ayiri, 77, 82, Mountain, 116.

B

Babylon, 205, 206, 207.
Balita, 177.
Bareilly District, 215.
Baris, 81, 106.
Basarnagos, 69.
Batois, 99, 172.

Bay of Bengal, 118.
Bhāratam, 197.
Bharatam Pāḍiya Perundēvanār, 28, 32, 33, 255.
Bhārata Veṇbā, 33.
Bharukacca, 205.
Bhattiprolu Caskets, 14.
Bodhisattvas, 25.
Bouddha Vestiges of Kāñcipura, 135.
Bose, B. Sc., Mr. P. N., 7.
Brahmadāyam, 215.
Brahmagiri Hill, 6.
Brahmana Makkaḷ or Mākkaḷ, 230.
Brahminical Tantras, 219.
Brahmanic Religion, 9.
Brahmani Magoi, 229.
Brahmanism, 237, 253.
Brahmans, 214, 215.
Brahmi Epigraphs, 208.
Brahmi Lipi, 206.
Bruno, 23.
Buchanan, Dr., 176.
Buddha, 135.
Buddhism, 10, 181, 206, 219, 237, 251, 253.
Buddhists, 9, 220.
Buddhist India, 205.
Buddhist Philosophy, 251.
Buddhist Tāra Temple, 135.
Buhler, Dr., 27.
Burke, 7.
Burma, 23, 206.
Burnell, Dr., 23, 176, 177, 207, 208.
Byzantium, 117, 174.
Byzantine Greeks, 174.

C

Calayam-Chaliatta, 177.
Caldwell, Dr., 2, 62, 63, 176, 227.
Calicut, 178.
Caligula, 184, 185.
Cambay, 176.
Canara, 82, 137.
Cannanore, 77, 172.
Cape Comorin, 106, 111.
Caracalla, 179, 185.
Castes and Tribes of Southern India, 215.
Cāttan, 188, 189.
Cēḍcenni, 120, 143.
Cēḍcenni Nalamkiḷḷi, 89, 141, 142, 143, 166, 185.
Ceḷiyan, 152.
Celva-Kaḍuṅkō, 116, 132.
Cempulappeynīrār, 39.
Ceṅkuṭṭuvan, 124, 125, 126, 144.
Ceṅkuṭṭuvan-Gajabāhu Synchronism, 161.
Cenni, 50, 89, 90, 95, 98, 119, 120, 130, 141, 143, 144.
Ceruppāḷi, 119.
Ceruppāḷi-eṟinta - Iḷancēḍcenni, 50, 119, 120.
Cevvaḷi, 211.
Ceylon, 23, 206.
Chaityas, 135.
Chandragiri River, 172.
Chazarla, 135.
Chēra, 28, 36, 37, 39, 51, 52, 57, 60, 62, 73, 77, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 90, 91, 92, 95, 103, 105, 106, 107, 108, 110, 111, 112, 116, 118, 124, 126, 136, 137, 138, 140, 146, 148, 149, 151, 153, 155, 156, 158, 159, 172, 174, 176, 192, 231, 232; Capital, 73, 231, 232, 233; Dominions, 112, 116, 126, 137, 172, 249; King, 28, 37, 54, 59, 73, 81, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 90, 91, 95, 105, 106, 109, 111, 112, 116, 118, 124, 126, 137, 138, 139, 140, 146, 148, 153, 155, 156, 157, 158, 174, 176.
Chēra King Peruñchēral, 126.
"Chēra of the Elephant look", 148, 149, 199.
Chēralar, 229.
Chēralar-magan, 229.
Chēralātan, 111.
Chēramān, 229.
Chēramān-Kaṇaikkāl Irumpoṟai, 155.
Chēramān-Ko-Kōdai - Mārpan, 152, 153.
Chēramān Kuḍakkō Ilañchēral Irumpoṟai, 136.
Chēramān Kuṭṭuvan Kōdai, 146.
Chēramān Māri Vaṇkō, 151, 153.
Chēramān Pālai Pāḍiya Perumkaḍuṅkō, 158.
Chēramān Vañcan, 158.
Cheruppu, 77.
Chidambaram, 178, 220.
Chiefs, 51, 52, 57, 73, 82, 85, 105, 118, 125, 140, 146, 150, 153, 157.
Chinese Pilgrim, 177.
Chingleput, 62, 227.
Chīrini, 175.
Chitaldrug, 6, 83, 168.
Chōḷas, 39, 50, 51, 52, 58, 60, 62, 63, 67, 69, 70, 71, 77, 78, 80, 83, 88, 89, 90, 94, 95, 96, 106, 112, 117, 119, 125, 131, 133, 135, 140, 142, 143, 144, 148, 149, 151, 168, 170, 173, 185, 192, 193, 194, 195, 202, 228, 252, 259, 261; History, 60, 98, 125, 141, 191, 259; Kings, 50, 52, 58, 59, 60, 63, 67, 69, 71, 75, 76, 78, 83, 85, 86, 87, 88, 90, 94, 95, 97, 106,

107, 109, 111, 119, 128, 130, 131, 140, 141, 148, 150, 155, 156, 158, 166, 192, 227, 260; Kingdom, 142, 143, 172, 259, 261.
Chōlamaṇḍalam, 261.
Chronology of India, 170.
Cilappadikāram, 41, 42, 45, 111, 124, 125, 127, 144, 162, 176, 188, 190, 205, 247, 251.
Ciṟukuḍi Kiḻan, 150.
Ciṟumēdāviyār, 256.
Ciṟupāṇāṟṟuppaḍai, 15, 201, 202.
Ciṟuttoṇḍar, 220.
Cittalai, 189.
Cittalai Cāttan, 156, 189, 197, 199.
Cittiramāḍattu - tuñciya - Nanmāṟan, 158.
Claudius, 182, 184, 185.
Clifford, Prof. W. F., 196, 254.
Cochin, 73, 81, 177, 178.
Coimbatore, 74, 76, 77, 79, 82, 104, 106, 117, 123, 126, 169, 231, 232 252.
Coins of Southern India, 27, 157.
Coins of Tinnevelly, The, 237, 249.
Colebrooke, 264.
Commodus, 184, 185.
Conjeevaram, 178.
Coorg, 230.
Cottanara, 176.
Cranganore, 6, 232.
Cuḷḷiyāṟu, 232, 233.
Cunningham, General, 63, 117.

D

Daivaccilaiyār, 238.
Dakshiṇāpada, 227.
Damirica, 137, 172, 176.
Dāmōdaram Pillai, C. W., 34, 224.
Dāmōdaranār, 141, 147, 197.
Daṇḍakāraṇya, 139.
Davids, Dr. T. W. Rhys, 27, 205, 208.
Dekkhan, 227.
Denarius, 183.
Dēvadāyam, 215.
Dēvanandi Pūjyapāda, 26.
Dēvāram, 10, 45, 215, 217, 218, 219, 220.
Dēvāram Hymnists, 217, 219.
Diamper, 103.
Di-Kho, 85.
Di-Sang, 85.
Domitian, 182, 184, 185.
Dramiḍaka, 137.
Drāvidi, 3.
Dravidian, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 17, 84, 193, 205, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213; Civilization, 2, 5, 6, 105, 207, 210; History, 4, 6; Language, 3, 213; Race, 6, 207, 228.
Dubreuil, Prof., 117.
Duff, 170.
Durga, 219.
Dwārasamudra, 21.

E

Early History of India, 6, 14, 135, 190.
Early Literature of the Tamils, 14, 16, 263.
Eastern Ghats, 82.
Eḍaikkunṟūr Kiḻār, 145.
Editor of *Patiṟṟuppattu*, 124.
Eight Collections, 15, 27, 28, 41, 199.
Eighteen Didactic Works, 16, 204.
Ekkūr, 178.
Elangkon, 177.
Elephant Country, 118, 231.
Elephant-marked Coins of Madura, 170, 249.
Eḻil, 77, 172.
Eḻilmalai, 77, 169, 175, 251, 252.
Eḻini, 39.
Eḻini I, 158.
Eḻini II, 125.
Eḻini III, 146.
Eḻini IV, 157.
Eḻini Atan, 147, 150, 167.
Elliot, Sir Walter, 27, 157.
Eḻumuḍi, 66.
Ēnādi, 195.
Ēnādi Tirukkuṭṭuvan, 140.
Ēṇiccēri, 106, 109, 110, 116.
Ēṇiccēri Muḍamōsiyār, 86, 87, 103.
Epigraphica Indica, 168.
Epochs of Civilization, 7.
Eṟiccilūr, 141, 143.
Eroici Furori, 23
Eṟṟai, 78, 85.
Erukkāḍu, 150, 157.
Erumai 82.
Erumaiyūran, 82, 146.
Ethnologists, 4.
Eṭṭuttokai, 15, 27, 41, 189, 199.
Evvi, 39, 122.
Evvi I, 99, 107, 108, 122.
Evvi II, 108, 122, 125.
Evviyar, 99.
Eyil Paṭṭinam, 177.
Eyinan, 78, 79, 85, 170.
Eyinars, 64, 78, 82.

F

Fabricius, 175.
Ferguson, J., 227.
Frederick Goodrich Henke, 218.

G

Galba, 185.
Gandhara, 227.
Ganga Family, 170.
Gangavadi, 170.
Gautama, 129.
Girnār, 168.
Godavari, 177.
Gopinatha Rao, Mr. T. A., 135, 208.
Greece, 174.
Greeks, 117, 178, 184, 192, 264; Authors, 73, 163, 165, 172, 173, 174; Writings, 162, 175, 178;
Gupta Period, 264.
Guntūr, 135.

H

Haddon, A. C., 117.
Hadrian, 182, 184, 185.
Harāppa, 3, 207.
Herder, 215, 216.
Hiḍa, 168, 169.
Hiḍa King, 168, 169, 170.
Himalayas, 111, 125, 126, 251, 252.
Hinduism, 25, 219.
Hindu Reaction, 39, 135.
Hiouen-Thsang, 177.
Hippalus, 179.
Hirananda Sastrī, M.A., Mr., 219.
History of Indian Logic, 129.
History of the Tamils, 51.
Hobson-Jobson, 23.
Hocart, A. M., 24.
'Hora', 264.

I

Iconography, 208.
Iḍa, 169.
Iḍaikkāḍar, 148, 235, 236.
Iḍayar, 169.
Iḍayarmagan, 170.
Iḍumbil, 125.
Iḷaiyar, 64.
Iḷampūraṇar, 238.
Iḷanāgan, 35, 149.
Iḷañceḍcenni, 119, 120.
Iḷañchēral Irumporai, 136.
Iḷango-Aḍigal, 127, 190, 251.
Iḷaṅkaḍuṅkō, 199.
Iḷaṅ-kandīrakkō, 155.
Iḷaṅkīranār, 103, 105.
Iḷaṅkumaṇan, 155.
Iḷantiraiyan, 158.
Ilavantikaippaḷḷi, 149.
Ilavantikaippaḷḷi-tuñciya-Nalamkiḷḷi, 141.
Ilavantikaippaḷḷi-tuñciya-Nanmāṛan, 146.
Iḷaveḷimān, 155.
Iḷaviccikkō, 155.
Imayavaramban, 111, 116, 117.
Imayavaramban Neḍuñchēralātan, 111.
India, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 23, 84, 111, 135, 145, 160, 162, 168, 169, 175, 176, 180, 183, 184, 186, 205, 206, 207, 209, 219, 228, 229, 231, 251, 252, 261, 264.
Indian Astronomy, 264.
Indra-Sala-Giri, 135.
Influences of Geographical Environment, 65, 216.
Iṛaiyanār, 255.
Iṛaiyanār Agapporuḷ, See *Agapporuḷ*.
Irumpiṭarttalaiyār, 38, 129, 133.
Irumpoṛai, 81, 83, 126, 136.
Iruṅkō, 128, 140.
Irunkōvēḷ, 128, 140.
Irunkōvēḷ II, 140.

J

Jacobi, 264.
Jains, 9, 26, 27, 135, 145, 220.
Jainendra, 26.
Jainism, 27, 187, 206.
Java, 23.
Jesperson, Dr., 248.
Julien Vinson, Prof., 40.

K

Kaḍal-Pirakkōṭṭiya Vēl-Keḻu-Kuṭṭuvan, 124, 176.
Kadamba Tribes, 111, 124, 176, 215.
Kadappiḷḷai, 155.
Kaḍattanāḍu, 176.
Kaivaḻi, 211.
Kākkaipāṭṭiniyār Nacceḷḷaiyār, 39, 126, 128, 139.
Kaḷabhra Interregnum, 194, 237, 261.
Kaḷaṅkāykkaṇṇi Narmuḍichēral, 126, 138.
Kaḷantai, 62.
Kaḻai-tin-yānaiyār, 39.
Kaḻār, 73, 80, 85, 158.
Kaḻāttalaiyār, 39, 91, 92, 109, 110, 112, 191.
Kaḷattūr, 62.
Kalavali Nāṛpatu, 155, 156, 195.
Kalaviyal, 20, 254; 135-263.
Kalingattupparaṇi, 156.
Kalittokai, or *Kali.*, 15, 23, 28, 30, 34, 35, 37, 41, 42, 44, 189, 199, 205, 206, 224, 235.

Kuṟuñci, 30, 35; 3-245; 24-243 57-224; Marutam, 35; 25-244 92-224; 98-225; Mullai, 35; 104-225; Neytal, 35; 141-225; 143-225; Pālai, 34, 35; 30-224: 35-224.
Kallāḍanār, 145, 147, 197, 259.
Kalsi, 168.
Kaḻumalam, 174.
Kaḷvar, 62, 147.
Kamban, 188.
Kaṇaikkāl Irumpoṟai, 156, 157.
Kanakasabhai Pillai, 73, 190, 231, 232.
Kanappēreyil, 143, 151, 152, 153, 172.
Kanarese, 26, 228; Country, 230; Literature, 27.
Kāncipuram, 10, 194, 196.
Kandan, 155.
Kanda Piḷḷai, 155.
Kanda Piḷḷai Cattanār, 155.
Kaṇḍīram, 126.
Kaṅkan, 39, 78, 85.
Kaṇṇakanār, 53.
Kaṇṇaki, 127, 128.
Kaṇṇanār, 154, 183.
Kaṇṇattanār, 110.
Kapāḍapuram, 23, 24.
Kapilar, 32, 33, 35, 59, 91, 92, 98, 107 119, 120. 127, 128, 140, 161, 191, 197, 202, 203, 210, 235, 240, 241.
Kāppiyāṟṟu Kāppiyanār, 36.
Kāri, 39, 118, 134.
Karikālan, 49, 50, 58, 59, 60, 70, 81, 88, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 126, 129, 130, 132, 133, 134, 137, 141, 148, 181, 196.
Karikālan I, 85, 90, 91, 93, 95, 98, 112, 120, 174.
Karikālan the Great (or Karikālan II) 58, 59, 70, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 107, 119, 126, 128, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 138, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 148, 149, 158, 166, 173, 185, 186, 191, 195, 196, 200, 201, 202, 210, 259, 261.
Kārikkaṇṇanār I, 106, 131, 141.
Kārikkaṇṇanār II, 146, 149.
Kārināyanār, 134.
Kāriyār, 143.
Karmara, 173.
Karuṇandaḍakkan, 170.
Karuṅkai-oḷ-vāḷ-Perumpeyar Vaḻudi, 133.
Karuvūr, 73, 81, 82, 83, 84, 86, 87, 88, 108, 124, 138, 148, 155, 173, 178, 179, 183, 192, 196, 231, 232, 233, 260.
Karuvūr-Ēṟiya-oḷ-vāḷ-kō-Peruñchēral Irumpoṟai, 81, 83.
Karuvūr-Kiḻār, 196.
Karuvūr - Peruñcatukkattuppūdanār, 83.
Kashmira, 227.
Kaṭṭi, 39, 78, 80, 85.
Kāṭṭūr Kiḻār, 154.
Kuṭṭuvan Iḷamaḷḷanār, 152.
Kāvidi, 195.
Kāviri, 66, 67, 69, 73, 76, 80, 81, 93, 96, 99, 112, 230, 233.
Kāvirippaṭṭinam, 6, 131, 141, 146, 149, 178, 197.
Kavisāgara Perundēvanār, 22, 255.
Kāycina Vaḻudi, 152.
Kaye, G. R., 264.
Keith, Dr. A. Berriedale, 209, 251, 264,
Kēraḷa, 229.
Kēraḷaputra, 168, 193, 229.
Kern, H., 25, 219.
Kiḻamai, 193.
Kiḻārs, 22, 67, 96, 134, 193.
Kiḻavar, 67, 193.
Kiḷḷi, 39, 50, 89, 90, 98, [illegible] 119, 120, 130, 141, 143, 144.
Kiḷḷi Vaḷavan, 143, 148, 150, 153.
Kingship, 24.
Kīranār, 110.
Kō, 65, 85, 88, 96, 193.
Kō-Ceṅkaṇṇan, 155, 156, 166, 185, 191, 194, 195.
Koḍukūr, 125.
Koḍunāḍu, 176.
'*Kol*', 154, 213, 236, 242, 243, 246, 247, 248.
Kōlattunāḍu, 176.
Kōḻi, 74, 75.
Kōḻiyūr, 74, 106.
Kolli Mount, 118, 231.
'*Koṇ*', 82.
Kongar, 82, 83.
Kongu, 76, 77, 78, 79, 82, 83, 112, 117, 118, 121, 123, 124, 169, 231, 232.
Koṇkānam, 82, 83, 169.
Kō-Peruñchōḻan, 53, 156, 158.
Koṟkai, 6, 72, 98, 99, 101, 102, 107, 108, 114, 120, 163, 178, 249.
Kōsars, 95.
Kōtamaṅgalam, 231.
Kōṭṭampalam, 103.
Kōṭṭampalattu - tuñciya - Chēramān, 103, 158, 199.
Kottanara, 73.
Korellour, 81.
Kōvalan, 127.
Kōvalūr, 153.
Krishnaswami Aiyangar, Dr. S., 188, 189, 190.
Kshēmēndra, 2.

Kubēra, 105.
Kuḍagu, 231.
Kūḍākāram, 149.
Kūḍākārattu-tuñciya-Māran Valudi, 149.
Kuḍakkō-Chēral-Irumporai, 136.
Kuḍakkō-Neḍumchēralātan, 116.
Kūḍal, 6, 23, 25, 72, 74, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 107, 108, 110, 112, 113, 114, 120, 122, 123, 124, 145, 163, 170, 173, 179, 192, 260.
Kūḍalūr Kiḻār, 28, 149.
Kuḍanāḍu, 81, 82, 84, 137.
Kuḍantai, 97.
Kuḍapulaviyanār, 145.
Kuḍavāyil, 88, 89.
Kuḍavāyil Kīrattanār, 78, 174.
Kuḍavāyil Kōṭṭam, 156.
Kuḍirai Malai, 118, 147, 150.
Kuḷantai, 62.
Kulapatināyanār, 256.
Kuḷattūr, 62.
Kuḻumam, 104.
Kuḻumūr, 81, 103, 104.
Kuḷamurratut-tuñciya-Kiḷḷi Vaḷavan, 148, 164, 185.
Kūlavāṇikan Cīttalai Cāttan, 188, 189, 190.
Kumaṇan, 155.
Kumbakōṇam, 88, 195.
Kuṇḍukaṇ-Pāliyātan, 39.
Kuṛaḷ, 10, 16, 42, 45, 126, 127, 189, 197, 204, 217, 240, 255, 256.
Kurāppaḷḷi, 131, 132, 143.
Kurāppaḷḷi - tuñciya - Perumtirumāvaḷavan, 131, 132.
Kuṟavars, 64, 210, 227, 228.
Kurukshētra, 104.
Kuṟumbar, 83, 227, 228.
Kuṟumporai, 81.
Kuṟuṅkōḻiyūr, 74, 106.
Kuṟuṅkōḻiyūr Kiḻar, 149.
Kuṟuncippāṭṭu, 30, 201, 202, 203, 235.
Kuṟuntokai, 12, 15, 28, 29, 32, 35, 37, 38, 39, 41, 138, 258-63; 258-68; 298-99; 393-123.
Kuṭamalai, 230.
Kuṭṭanāḍu, 73, 81, 124, 176.
Kuṭṭuvan, 117, 176.
Kuṭṭuvan Irumporai, 124.
Kuṭṭuvan Kīranār, 106.

L

Larica, (Latica), 176.
Lassen, 176.
Lewis Rice, Mr. B., 215.
Literary Criticism in the Renaissance, 23.
Loventhal Rev. E., 237, 249, 253.
Lucius Verus, 185.

M

Mācāttiyār, (Macāttanār), 178.
Māḍalan Maḍuraikkumaranār, 141, 143, 146.
Madeya, 23.
Madura, 6, 14, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 34, 72, 74, 98, 99, 105, 113, 127, 145, 170, 173, 175, 183, 220, 224, 237, 249, 250, 255.
Maḍuraikkāñci, 15, 132, 136, 145, 146 182, 201, 202.
Magour, 173.
Mahābhāratam, 16, 30, 33, 256.
Mahābhārata War, 104, 105.
Mahārāshtra, 176.
Mahāvamso, 162, 190.
Mahāyāna, 219, 251.
Mahendra Varma, 135.
Maine, Sir H. S., 12.
Majjhantiko, 227.
Malabar, 82, 179.
Malaimaṇḍalam, 261.
Malaipaḍukaṭām, 15, 201, 202, 256.
Malaiyamān, 148.
Malaiyamān Tirumuḍi Kāri, 134, 148.
Malakūṭa, 230.
Malanga, 177.
Maḻava community, 64, 82, 210.
Malavalli Pillar, 215.
Malaiyamān Nāḍu, 231.
Mallan, 74, 75.
Māmallapuram, 10, 15, 177.
Māmūlanār, 34, 48, 103, 158, 197, 199.
'*Man*', 67, 154, 229, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 248.
Maṇakkiḷḷi, 125.
Mandagara, 118.
Māndai, 118.
Mangalore, 137, 172.
Mānikkavācagar, 16, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221.
Maṇimekalai, 42, 45, 125, 188, 189, 190, 205, 251.
Manjusri, 25.
Maṅkuḍi Kiḻār, *alias* Maṅkuḍi Maruḍan, 145, 146, 147, 149, 197, 201, 202.
'*Manṟa*', 241, 242.
Mansehra, 168.
Māntaran Chēral Irumporai, 149.
Māntaran Poṟaiyan Kaḍuṅkō, 116.
Manual of Indian Buddhism, 25, 219.

Māṟan Vaḻudi, 28, 149.
Marapu Iyal, 626-260; 637-261.
Mārcus Aurelius, 185.
Māri Veṇkō *alias* Mā Veṇkō, 151, 153.
Māṟōkkam, 150.
Marudan Iḷanāganār, 35, 67, 68, 146, 147, 149, 150, 155, 191, 208.
Marutam, 30, 32, 34, 35, 36, 199, 211.
Maski, 14.
Matti, 73, 80, 85, 158.
Mauryan Empire, 83, 168.
Māvilaṅkai, 177.
Max Miiller, Prof., 7.
Mayūra Varma, 215.
Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, No. 18-264; No. 20-219.
Menon, Mr. K. P. P., 176.
Migñili, 79.
Modern Review, (1913), 7.
Modoura, 163.
Mōgūr, 174.
Mohenjo Dāro, 3, 207.
Monolithic Temples, 10.
Morley, Lord, 7.
Mōsi, 110.
Mōsi Kaṇṇattanār, 110.
Mōsikīranār, 110, 124, 197.
Mōsippaṭṭi, 110.
Mōsukuḍi, 110.
Mount D'ely, 77, 175.
Muḍamōsiyār, 106, 109, 110, 116, 191.
Muḍattāmakkaṇṇiyār, 92, 201.
Muḍavanār of Aiyūr, 150.
Muḍināgarāyar, 103, 104, 105.
Mudira Malai, 155.
Muḍittalai-kō-Perunaṟkiḷḷi, 85, 86, 106, 111, 166.
Mudukaṇṇan Cāttanār, 143.
Mudukuḍumi *alias* Mudukuḍumī Peruvaḻudi, 135, 144, 145, 261.
Mukkaṇṇi Kadumba, 215.
Mukunti Pallava, 215.
Mūlam Kiḻār, 150, 152.
Mullai, 30, 32, 34, 36.
Mullaippāṭṭu, 15, 200, 201, 202.
Muḷḷūr, 118, 134.
Muraṅciyūr; 103, 104.
Murugan, 203, 257.
Musiṟi, 6, 19, 151, 152, 232.
Musiṟi Muṟṟiya Cēḻiyan, 151.
Mutukūṟṟanār, also known as Mutukūttanār, 67, 70.
Mūvan, 157.
Mysore, 14, 82, 83, 118, 126, 168.
Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions, 215.

N

Naccel̤laiyār, 226.
Naccinārkkiniyar, 96.
Nāga Chieftains, 143, 227.
Nāga Tribes, 63, 173, 227, 228, 259.
Nakkaṇṇai or Nakkaṇṇaiyār, 63, 64, 70, 74, 75, 161, 226.
Nakkīrar or Nakkīranār, 19, 23, 29, 48, 123, 146, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 161, 191, 197, 201, 202, 203, 226, 236.
Nālaḍiyār, 16.
Nalam Kiḷḷi, 141, 142, 143, 144, 148, 150, 172, 173, 226.
Nalkūr Vēḷviyār, 22.
Nallantuvanār, 28, 34, 35, 224, 226.
Naḷḷi, 39, 211.
Nallini, 85, 86.
Naḷḷikānam, 231.
Nalliṟaiyanār, 226.
Nalliyakkōḍan, 177, 201.
Nallūr Nattattanār, 201.
Nalluruttiran, 35, 158, 226.
Nalveḷḷiyār, 226.
Nalvēṭṭanār, 226.
Nalviḷakkanār, 226.
Nambiāṇḍār Nambi, 217.
Nañcilnāḍu, 155, 167.
Nañcil Vaḷḷuvan, 155.
Nandipōttarasan, 33.
Nāṅkūrvēḷ, 47.
Nanmāṟan, 149.
Nannan, 77, 78, 79, 82, 106, 201.
Nannan I, 85, 126.
Nannan II, 124, 126.
Nannāganār, 226.
'Naoura', 137.
Napoleon, 140.
Nappālattanār, 226.
Nappasalaiyār, 150, 226.
Nappūdanār, 201.
Naṟavu, 137, 172.
Narayanaswami Aiyar, Pandit, 95.
Naṟcōṇai, 125, 126, 226.
Nariveruttalaiyāṟ, 39, 84, 109, 197 256.
Naṟkiḷḷi, 50, 150.
Naṟṟiṇai, 12, 15, 28, 29, 32, 33, 35, 37, 38, 41, 90, 95, 110, 198, 199, 10-77; 18-157; 51-243; 58-67; 87-70 94-246; 100-63; 110-243; 113-103; 122-243; 150-152; 180-90; 205-244; 225-245; 237-106; 265-90; 305-244, 395-118.
Naura, 117, 172.
Nāyanmārs, 217, 219.
Neḍumkiḷḷi, 141, 142, 143.
Neḍumpalliyattanār, 132.

Neḍunalvāḍai, 15, 201, 202.
Neḍuñceḻiyan, 102, 103, 124, 152.
Neḍuñceḻiyan I, 98, 102, 107, 120, 163.
Neḍuñceḻiyan II, 108, 121, 131, 163.
Neḍuñceḻiyan III, 132, 145, 146, 147, 167.
Neḍuñchēralātan, 111, 116, 117, 124, 125, 126, 144, 172, 174, 176, 251.
Neḍuntērceḻiyan, 98, 102, 114.
Nelcynda, 163, 175.
Nero, 184, 185.
Nerva, 184, 185.
Nētravati, 137.
Neṭṭimaiyār, 132.
'Neytal', 30, 32, 33, 35, 36.
Neytalaṅkānal, 96, 175.
Neytalaṅkānal Iḷañcēḍcenni, 119, 120.
Nīḍāmangalam, 144.
Nīlakaṇṭan, 19, 175.
Nilam-taru-tiruvil Pāṇḍiyan, 120, 121, 124, 132, 145.
Nilgiris, 82.
Nitria, 137.
Noura, 137.
Nyāya-Kōsa, 129.

O

Ōḍaikiḻār, 106.
Ōkandūr, 116.
Okkūr, 178.
Ollaiyūr, 108, 112.
Ollaiyūr Kiḻār, 196.
Ollaiyūr-tanta-Pūtappāṇḍiyan, 112, 115, 122, 124, 163.
On the Ancient Coins and Measures of Ceylon, 27.
Ōrampōkiyār, 30, 32.
Ōri, 39, 118.
Oriental and Linguistic Studies, 4.
Origin and Cult of Tāra, 219.
Origin and Development of the Bengali Language, 213.
Orthoura, 62.
Orucirai Periyanār, 155.
Ōtalāntai or Ōtalāntaiyār, 30, 32, 34.

P

Paḍappai, 81.
Paḍappu, 81.
Paḍumāṟṟūr, 110.
Pahlava, 117.
Pahruḷi River, 132.
Paisachi, 3.
'Palai', 30, 32, 34, 36, 77, 199.
Pālai Kautamanār, 118.
Pālai Pāḍiya Peruṅkaḍuṅkō, 34, 35, 199.
Paḻaiyan, 76, 77, 78, 85, 174.
Paḻaiyan Māṟan, 153.
Pālār, 96, 119, 175, 177, 227.
Pālāyi, 81, 106.
Pāli, 78, 79, 206.
Pallava, 10, 50, 63, 64, 69, 188, 196; Art, 15, 135; Invasion, 194; King, 10, 33, 215; Power, 25, 194, 261.
Palney Hills, 127.
Palsālai, 135.
Palsālai Muḍukuḍumi or Palsālai, Muḍukuḍumi Peruvaḻudi or Palyāgasalai Muḍukuḍumi Peruvaḻudi, 49, 129, 131, 132, 133, 135, 196.
Palyāgasālai, 135.
Palyānai-cel-keḻu-Kuṭṭuvan, 116, 117, 118, 231.
Panampāranār, 259.
Pāṇḍiya, 21, 28, 39, 51, 52, 58, 59, 60, 62, 72, 92, 98, 100, 102, 103, 106, 107, 108, 110, 112, 120, 121, 122, 124, 133, 135, 144, 147, 148, 149, 151, 152, 156, 157, 163, 164, 165, 167, 168, 170, 171, 187, 192, 249; Coins, 253; Country, 89, 124, 143, 163, 164, 172, 260; King, 25, 53, 81, 99, 101, 102, 107, 108, 113, 114, 120, 123, 129, 131, 134, 143, 145, 146, 151, 156, 163, 165, 199, 249.
'Pāṇḍu Kuḻi,' 14.
Pannāḍu-tanta-Pāṇḍiyan, 28, 120, 121, 198, 199.
Paṇṇan, 150.
'Paṇs', 211.
'Paralia of the Soretai,' 120, 173, 177.
Pāram, 77.
Paramakuḍi, 110.
Parambu Hill, 118.
Param-kunṟu, 175.
Paraṇar, 33, 48, 58, 59, 63, 68, 69, 70, 71, 75, 79, 80, 90, 91, 93, 95, 99, 102, 107, 112, 116, 118, 119, 122, 123, 124, 127, 128, 129, 153, 154, 161, 191, 197, 210, 235, 236, 251.
Paratavars, 64, 80.
Pāri, 39, 40, 118, 128, 140.
Paripāḍal, 15, 23, 28, 37, 41, 42, 44, 263.
Parthians, 117.
Pasalai Nāgar, 69.
Pasumpūṇ Cenni, 129.
Pasumpūṇ Pāṇḍiyan, 49, 108, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 133, 163, 164, 165, 166, 170, 171, 249, 250.
Pāṭaliputtiram, 136.

Patirruppattu, 15, 28, 36, 41, 43, 44, 57, 83, 84, 85, 86, 105, 110, 111, 117, 118, 124, 125, 137, 138, 139, 172, 174, 176, 200, 231, 233; **52**-138; **56**-138; **57**-138; **28**-233; **43**-233; **88**-233.
Paṭṭinappālai, 15, 130, 136, 140, 181, 200, 201, 202.
Pattuppāṭṭu, 15, 27, 38, 41, 42, 44, 130, 181, 189, 200, 207, 225, 229.
Pavaṇandi, 246, 247, 248.
Pēkan, 127, 128.
Peṇṇai or Pennār, 81, 175, 177, 231.
Peoples of India, 84.
Pērālavāyār, 100, 107, 108, 110, 112.
Pērālavāyil, 23, 74.
Pēreyil Muṟuvalār, 156.
Periplus of the Erythraean Sea, 39, 116, 118, 137, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 170, 174, 175, 176, 177, 179, 180, 183, 186, 187.
Periyapurāṇam, 134, 156, 217, 232.
Periyār, 66, 73, 81, 82, 83, 106, 155, 232, 233.
Persia, 117, 229.
Perumchēral Irumporai, 124, 126, 136.
Perumchēralātan, 91, 95, 113.
Perumchōṟṟātan *alias* Perumchōṟṟutiyan Chēralātan, 91, 103, 104.
Perumkalittokai, 23.
Perumkōḻi Naikan, 70, 74.
Perumkōḻiyūr, 74, 106.
Perumkunṟūr Kiḻār, 128, 137.
Perumpaḍappai, 81.
Perumparipāḍal, 23.
Perumpāṇāṟṟuppaḍai, 15, 158, 201, 202.
Perumpēkan, 127.
Perumpūṇ Cenni, 90, 119, 174.
Perum-tiru-Māvaḷavan, 132, 148.
Peruntuṟai, 97.
Perunaḷḷi, 126.
Peruñciltiranār, 155.
Perundēvanār, 16, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 197.
Peruṅkousikanār, 201.
Perunaṟkiḷḷi, 75, 85, 153.
Peruntalai Cāttanār, 155, 157.
Perumtōḷātan, 91, 95.
Pēyanār, 30, 32, 34.
Pinākini, 175.
Ping-k'i-lo, 177.
Pirate Coast, 118.
Pisir-Antaiyār, 53.
Piṭṭan, 147, 150.
Piṭṭan I, 147.
Piṭṭan II, 147.
Piṭṭan Koṟṟan, 147, 150.
Pliny, 39, 137, 162, 173, 176, 179, 180, 183, 186.
Poduvars, 94.
Poigaiyār, 153, 155, 157, 158.
Pope, Dr., 50, 240.
Pōr, 76, 77, 85, 88, 112, 119, 156.
Poṟaiyāṟṟukiḻān, 147.
Poṟaiyāṟu, 155.
Portuguese, 177.
Porunai, 66, 98, 232, 233.
Porunarāṟṟuppaḍai, 15, 92, 130, 136, 200, 201, 202.
Porunar, 257.
Poruntil Iḷaṅkīranār, 149.
Pōrvai, 75, 76.
Pōrvaikkō, 76, 78.
Pōrvaikkō Perunaṟkiḷḷi, 75, 166, 185.
Pothiyil, 77, 78, 113, 114, 115, 118, 122, 123, 147, 163, 165, 167, 169, 170, 171.
Pothiyil Celvan, 115, 163.
Pottiyār, 53.
Prakrit, 12, 212.
Priyadarsin, 168.
Pseudostosmos, 106.
Ptolemy, 39, 62, 69, 74, 81, 83, 89, 99, 106, 117, 120, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 171, 172, 173, 174, 176, 177, 178, 179, 186, 187, 227, 228, 229.
Pulatturai Muṟṟiya Kūḍalūr Kiḻār, 28.
Pūḻināḍu, 82, 126, 174, 231.
Pullāṟṟūr Eyiṟṟiyanār, 53.
Pulli, 62, 147, 259.
Pullikāḍu, 62.
Puḷḷunāḍu, 78, 79, 82.
Punṟuṟai, 78, 85.
Puṟanānūṟu or *Puram.*, 12, 15, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 36, 37, 38, 41, 43, 44, 45, 50, 74, 78, 85, 86, 87, 93, 98, 99, 101, 105, 106, 112, 113, 116, 120, 121, 122, 126, 132, 133, 134, 142, 144, 145, 146, 147, 150, 151, 152, 153, 155, 156, 157, 198, 211, 230, 232, 237, 240, 241, 243, 244, 245, 246, 248, 250, 252, 258, 259, 263; **3**-133; **5**-85; **6**-133; **9**-122, 132; **11**-233; **13**-87; **15**-134; **26**-241; **27**-144; **45**-142; **48**-153; **49**-153; **52**-252; **54**-146; **62**-112; **63**-112; **65**-93; **66**-93; **67**-252; **71**-113; **72**-145 **74**-155; **75**-241; **76**-121; **80**-74; **99**-153; **128**-116; **129**-250; **130**-250; **136**-106; **149**-211; **170**-147; **172**-147; **173**-150; **201**-120; **206**-245; **208**-155; **209**-157; **224**-134; **225**-144; **233**-99; **234**-99, 245; **235**-245; **240**-106; **243**-245; **261**-

241; 273-244; 278-126; 328-101; 336-241; 343-244; 347-98, 246; 351-78, 246; 367-151; 374-106; 380-252; 381-232; 385-147; 391-147; 396-147.
Pūrikkō, 28, 198.
Pūtappāṇḍi, 122.
Pūtappāṇḍiyan, 108, 110, 112, 113, 114, 115, 122.
Pyrrhon, 117.

Q

Quilon, 178.

R

Rāghava Aiyangār, Pandit R., 61, 87, 230, 231.
Rājasūya Sacrifice, 50, 150, 151, 153.
Rājasuyam-Vēṭṭa-Perunaṟkiḷḷi, 50, 150, 166, 185, 191.
Rāmagiri, 134.
Rāmāyaṇa, 23.
Rāmēsvaram, 175, 178.
Rapson, Prof. E. J., 184.
Relative Ages of Puṟanāṉūṟu and Tolkāppiyam, 45.
Rice, E. P., 27.
Richards, F. J., 83.
Rig Veda, 45, 213.
Rig Vedic Dialect, 45; Period 263.
Rock Edicts, 168, 170.
Roman Coinage, 183, 184; Writers, 162, 163, 192; Trade, 179, 186.
Rome, 129, 180, 186.
Rudran Kaṇṇan II, 158.
Rudra Sanma Kaṇṇar, 22.

S

Ṣadāraṇyam, 175, 227.
Saiva Literature, 195.
Saiva Siddhanta Philosophy, 219.
Sakti, 219,
Sakyamuni, 25.
Sālai, 135.
Salem, 83, 118, 231, 233.
Salem Manual, 83.
Sallēkhana, 92.
Samayakuravars, 218.
Sāmudragupta, 62.
Sangam, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 41, 45, 70, 105, 116, 152, 189, 197, 203, 204, 235, 255, 258; Collections, 13, 42, 189, 197, 202; Literature, 1, 6, 15, 16, 17, 25, 27, 33, 37, 38, 40, 45, 47, 56, 106, 161, 175, 178, 183, 184, 186, 187, 190, 198, 258; Story or Tradition, 18, 26, 196, 197, 198; 254. Third, 21, 196, 197, 198, 238, 258.
Saṇkara, 219.
Sanskrit, 3, 12, 13, 21, 26, 33, 39, 85, 137, 145, 152, 174, 175, 176, 187, 206, 209, 212, 213, 216, 227, 230, 238, 264.
Sanskritists, 2, 3, 175, 177, 207, 209, 229.
Sapta Sailam, 77, 175.
Sātakarṇi, 176.
Sātavāhana, 215.
Satischandra Vidyābhūshana, Dr., 129.
Satiyaputra, 168, 193.
Sāttantaiyār, 74, 75, 161.
Satti Makkaḷ or Mākkal, 168, 169.
Sattimangalam Pass, 176.
Schoff, W. H., 172, 175, 177, 180, 183, 184.
Sēkkiḻār, 217.
Semetic Tribes, 206.
Semple, E. C., 65, 216.
Sēndan, 68, 69, 70, 71, 73.
Sēndamangalam, 70.
Septimius Severus, 185.
Seshagiri Sastri, 105.
Seyyul-Iyal, 391-260.
Shahbazgarhi, 168.
Siam, 206.
Siddhāpur, 6, 83, 168.
Sikandar Malai, 175.
Simhavishnu, 10.
Siva, 105, 156, 217, 219, 220.
Sivagñānabōdham, 219.
Siva Prajña, 219.
Sivaperumān Tiruvandādi, 235.
Skanda Giri, 175.
Smith, Dr. Vincent A., 6, 14, 73, 135, 160, 172, 190, 231.
Solomon's Ivory, 205.
Sopatma, 177.
Sōpaṭṭinam, 177, 178.
Sornagas, 69.
South Indian Coinage, 184.
South Indian Inscriptions, 14.
South Indian Palaeography, 177, 207.
Sovira, 205.
Spingairn, 23.
Sri Harsha, 62.
A Study in the Psychology of Ritualism, 218.
Subrahmanya, 205.
Sundara or Sundaramūrtti, 217, 218, 220.
Sundaram Pillai, Prof. P., 195.
Suniti Kumār Chātterjee, Prof., 213.
Su-Patana, 177.
Suppāraka, 205.

Swāminatha Aiyar, Pandit Mahāmahōpādhyāya, 14, 134.
Swarūpam, 81.
Synchronistic Tables, 38, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 53, 60, 132, 135, 152, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 163, 164, 165, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 179, 186, 187, 189, 191, 192, 193, 194, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 204, 205, 208, 209, 210, 215, 216, 225, 232, 235, 248, 253, 255, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263.

T

Tacitus, 180.
Taine, 214.
Takaḍūr, 124, 131.
Takaḍūr-erinta-Peruñchēral Irumporai, 124.
Talaiyālamkānam, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 165, 167, 171, 182.
Talaiyālamkānattu - Cēru - Venra Nedumcēliyan, 23, 25, 49, 132, 144, 165, 171, 201.
Tāmān Tānrikkōn, 150.
Tambāpanni, 168.
Tamil, 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 30, 40, 42, 45, 46, 51, 55, 58, 60, 61, 62, 64, 66, 69, 83, 84, 94, 96, 105, 106, 110, 112, 121, 130, 131, 132, 134, 135, 136, 137, 139, 152, 162, 163, 167, 168, 169, 170, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 182, 184, 188, 189, 190, 191, 195, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 212, 215, 216, 217, 221, 227, 228, 229, 230, 237, 238, 242, 243, 246, 249, 253, 254, 255, 258, 259, 261, 262, 263; Chronology, 45 162, 163, 167, 190; Country (Tamilagam), 9, 10, 13, 18, 22, 24, 25, 27, 39, 46, 51, 60, 62, 65, 66, 77, 83, 106, 110, 115, 131, 135, 136, 137, 140, 143, 163, 168, 170, 172, 175, 176, 178, 179, 180, 181, 183, 184, 186, 187, 188, 192, 193, 194, 196, 205, 208, 209, 214, 215, 216, 217, 227, 229, 231, 252, 254, 256, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263; History, 26, 44, 49, 61, 71, 89, 106, 125, 127, 139, 158, 161, 164, 167, 174, 175, 186, 187, 188, 190, 191, 194, 215, 216, 237, 258; Kings, 6, 10, 36, 61, 66, 106, 116, 130, 131, 134, 143, 148, 172, 176, 179, 185, 186, 194, 196, 201, 231, 232, 260; Lexicon, 116, 227; Literature, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 15, 20, 40, 45, 54, 64, 66, 131, 132, 157, 162, 163, 164, 165, 167, 168, 169, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 184, 187, 188, 189, 190, 205, 215, 217, 221, 227, 236, 238, 242, 249, 251, 252, 253, 255; Poets, 30, 35, 98, 106, 115, 121, 174, 178; Triumvirs, 51, 61, 66, 115, 169.
Tāmraparṇi, 66, 72, 98, 102, 233.
Tanjore, 88, 96, 145, 178.
Tānrikkōn, 150.
Tantrism, 219.
Tāyan Kaṇṇanār, 150, 151, 152.
Ten Idylls, 15, 27, 30, 38, 41, 130, 145, 200, 235.
Ten Tens, 36.
Thibaut, 264.
Thurston, 215.
Tiberius, 184.
Tiṇai, 35, 36, 47, 64.
Tinnevelly, 14, 98, 178.
'Tirams', 211.
Tiraiyan, 164.
Tiraiyars, 63, 64, 69, 154.
Tirugñānasambanda, or Jñanasambanda, 10, 45, 188, 189, 194, 217, 218, 220.
Tirukkārūr, 73, 230, 231.
Tirumāvaḷavan, 61.
Tirumāvuṇṇi, 127.
Tirumurai, 217, 235.
Tirumuruṇārruppaḍai, 15, 201, 202, 203, 204, 257.
Tiruppati, 62.
Tiruppōr, 156.
Tiruppūr, 76.
Tiruppūvaṇam, 110.
Tiruttoṇḍar Tiruvanḍādi, 217.
Tiruttoṇḍattokai, 217.
Tiruvācagam, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221.
Tiruvilaiyāḍalpurāṇam, 23, 134, 220, 235.
Tiruvalluvamālai, 22, 196, 197, 255.
Tiruvaḷḷuvar, 127, 204, 255.
Titiyan, 95, 113, 114, 115, 165, 167.
Titiyan II, 146, 147.
Tittan, 63, 67, 69, 72, 73, 74, 76, 88, 89, 142, 166, 191.
Tittan Veḷiyan, 73, 74, 75, 85, 166, 185, 260.
Titus, 182, 184, 185.
Toḍittalai Viḷuttaṇḍinār, 197.
Tolkāppiyam, 10, 19, 23, 45, 62, 189, 204, 205, 222, 223, 258, 259, 260, 263, 264.
Tolkāppiyar, 19, 45, 204, 223, 237, 238, 240, 241, 242, 243, 246, 247, 248, 253, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265.
Toṇḍaimān, 154, 229.
Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam, 134, 261.

Tondaimān Iḷantiraiyan, 154, 158, 201, 261.
Tondaiyar, 61, 63, 64, 154.
Tondi, 137, 157, 178.
Tōnṟikkōn, 150.
Travancore, 73, 122, 124, 163, 177, 249.
Travancore Archaeological Series, 170, 208.
Tree and Serpent Worship, 227.
Tribes of Southern India, 215.
Trichinopoly, 73, 76, 112, 231, 232, 233.
Trimūrtis, 219.
Trivandrum, 178.
Tuḷu country, 117, 126, 172.
Tuṟaiyūr, 106.
Tyndis, 117, 137, 172.

U

Udiyan, 85, 103, 104.
Udiyan Chēral *alias* Udiyan Chēralātan, 83, 85, 86, 91, 103, 104, 105, 112, 138.
Udiyanpērūr, 103.
Ukkirapperuvaḻudi, 143, 151, 152, 153, 172, 173, 198, 199.
Ulōccanār, 155.
Umpaṟkādu, 117, 231, 235, 249.
Ūnpotipasuṅkuḍaiyār, 38.
Urugapuram, 175.
Uṟaiyūr or Uṟantai, 6, 62, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 80, 86, 87, 88, 89, 96, 97, 98, 105, 106, 110, 111, 119, 120, 130, 141, 142, 143, 147, 175, 178, 179, 192, 260.
Uṟattūr, 62, 178.
Uṟuva-pah-tēr-Iḷancēdcenni, 59, 119, 125, 128, 142, 165, 166, 185, 191.
Uttara Rāmāyaṇam, 188.

V

Vaḍama Vaṇṇakkan Dāmōdaranār, 147.
Vaḍama Vaṇṇakkan Peruñcāttanār, 149, 150.
Vaḍapulam, 176, 251.
Vādavūrpurāṇam, 220.
Vaḍimbalamba-ninṟa-Pāṇḍiyan, 120, 121, 130.
Vaigai, 66, 99, 102, 114, 224.
Vaigal, 195.
Vaiyāvi, 127.
Vajranandi, 26.
Vākai, 78, 85, 94.
Vaḷavan, 148.
Vaḷḷuvan Kaṇḍan, 167.
Vañci, 232.
Vāṇidāsan, 188.
Vanigars, 22.
Vanjimānagar, 61.
Vanparaṇar, 128, 210.
Varāhamihira, 264.
Varkalai, 177.
Varuna, 262, 263.
Vāṭṭāṟu, 147, 167.
Vatteḻettu, 208.
Vēdars, 64, 99, 227, 228.
Vedic Dialect, 213; Period, 264; Rite, 136.
Vēḷ, 65, 67, 68, 193, 229, 260.
Veḷiman, 155.
Vēḷirs, 21, 85, 94, 96, 229.
Veḷiyan, 74, 75, 76, 78, 79, 80, 85, 86, 117, 191.
Veḷiyan Tittan, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 75, 166, 185, 260.
Vēl Keḻu Kuṭṭuvan, 90, 124, 125, 126, 137, 144.
Veḷḷerukkilaiyār, 99, 107.
Veḷḷiyambalattu-tuñciya - Perumaḻudi, 131, 132, 146.
Vēḷmagan, 67.
Vēḷmagal, 229.
Vēḷmāḷ, 229.
Vēḷmān, 67, 88, 89, 155, 229.
Vēḷpāh - taḍakkai - Perunaṟkiḷḷi or Peruviṟaṟkiḷḷi, 59, 109, 110, 111, 117, 119, 142, 166, 185.
Vēnkai Mārpan, 152, 153.
Vēnkaṭam, 158, 259.
Veṇṇi, 91, 92, 93, 112.
Veṇṇi-Kuyattiyār, 91, 92.
Veṇṇivāyil, 93.
Veṟi-Pāḍiya-Kāmakkaṇṇiyār, 257.
Veṟṟivēl Ceḻiyan, 102.
Vespasian, 182, 184, 185.
Vicci, 128.
Viccikkō, 128.
Village Communities, 4, 12, 210.
Villavar Tribe, 78.
Vīrai, 67, 68, 69, 71, 73, 88, 89, 98.
Vīrai Vēḷmān Veḷiyan Tittan, 71.
Viṣṇu, 249, 263.
Viṣṇuvardhana, 170.
Viyalūr, 125.

W

Wanderings of People, 117.
Weber, 264.
Western Ghats, 77, 82, 106, 231, 251, 252.
White Islands, 117.
Whitney, Prof., 4, 264.

Yāgas, 131, 133, 135, 196, 214, 215.
Yāḻ, 211.
Yānaikkaṇ-Māntaran-Chēral - Irumporai, 28, 149.
Yavanas, 117, 174.
Yōna, 168.
Yule, 23, 137, 172.

Zeno, 183.

AUTHORS AND WORKS CONSULTED.

(i) ENGLISH.

Allen, Carleton Kemp—*Village Communities and Customary Law.*

Anderson, J. D.—*Peoples of India.*

Bayley, Sir E. Clive—*On the Genealogy of the Modern Numerals.*

Bhandarkar, Dr. R. G.—*Early History of the Deccan.*

Breeks, J. W.—*Primitive Tribes and Monuments of the Nilgiris.*

Buhler, Prof. G.—*Memorandum to Sir C. Bayley on the Origin of the Indian Alphabet and Numerals.*

Burnell, Dr. A. C.—*South Indian Palaeography.*

Caldwell, Dr.—*Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages.*

Chatterji, Prof. Suniti Kumar—*The Origin and Development of the Bengali Language.*

Clifford, Prof. W. F.—*Collected Works.*

Cox, A. F. and H. H. Stuart—*Manual of North Arcot.*

Cunningham, Alexander—*Ancient Geography of India.*

Cust, Dr.—*The Origin of the Indian Alphabet.*

Das, Nobin Chandra—*Ancient Geography of Asia.*

Davids, Dr. Rhys—*Buddhist India.*

„ „ *On the Ancient Coins and Measures of Ceylon.*

Dubreuil, Prof. J.—*The Pallavas.*

„ „ *Pallava Antiquity, Vols. I and II.*

Duff—*Chronology of India.*

Dutt, Manmathnath—*Translation of Manu Samhita.*

Elliot, Sir W.—*Coins of Southern India.*

Fergusson, J.—*Tree and Serpent Worship.*

Geiger, Dr. Wilhelm—*Mahavamso.*

Goldstücker—*Pāṇini.*

Gopinatha Rao, T. A.—*History of Sri Vaishnavas.*

Gupta, Surendranath Das—*A History of Indian Philosophy.*

Haddon, Dr. A. C.—*Wanderings of Peoples.*

Henderson Keith—*Prehistoric Man.*

Henke, Frederick Goodrich—*A Study in the Psychology of Ritualism.*

Hirananda Shastri—*The Origin and Cult of Tāra.*

Hocart, A. M.—*Kingship.*

Hodgson, B. H.—*Miscellaneous Essays relating to Indian Subjects, Vol. I.*

Hopkins, E. Washburn—*Great Epic of India.*

Kanakasabhai Pillai—*Tamils, Eighteen Hundred Years Ago.*

Kaye, G. R.—*Hindu Astronomy.*

Keane, A. H.—*Man Past and Present.*

Kielhorn, Prof.—*Synchronistic Tables of the South Indian Kings.*

Keith, Dr. A. B.—*Buddhist Philosophy.*

" " *History of Sanskrit Literature.*

" " *Aitarēya Āraṇyaka.*

Kern, H.—*Manual of Indian Buddhism.*

Krishnaswami Aiyangar, Dr. S.—*Beginnings of South Indian History.*

" " *Early History of Vaiṣnavism in South India.*

Lee, Rev. Samuel—*The Travels of Ibn Batuta.*

Logan, William—*Manual of the Malabar District.*

Lōventhal, Rev. E.—*The Coins of Tinnevelly.*

McCrindle, J. W.—*The India of Arrian.*

" " *Megasthenes.*

" " *Ptolemy.*

" " *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea.*

Macdonell, Prof.—*History of Sanskrit Literature.*

Maine, Sir H. S.—*Village Communities.*

Moret, Prof. and A. Davy—*From Tribe to Empire.*

Morgan, Dr. Lewis H.—*Ancient Society.*

Morize André—*Problems and Methods of Literary History.*

Morley, Lord—*Burke.*

Muir, Dr. John—*The Oriental Studies.*

Nicholson, F. A.—*Coimbatore Manual.*

Oldenberg, Dr. H.—*On the Dates of Indian Inscriptions and Coins.*

Pittard Eugene—*Race and History.*
Pliny—*Natural History.*
Pope, Dr.—*Translation of the Puṟanāṉūṟu Lyrics.*
„ *Translation of Kuṟaḷ.*
Purnalingam Pillai, M. S.—*History of Tamil Literature.*
Ramavatara Sarma—*Piyadasi Inscriptions.*
Rapson, Professor E. J.—*Ancient India.*
„ „ *A Catalogue of Indian Coins in the British Museum.*
Rice, B. Lewis—*Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions.*
Rice, E. P.—*Kanarese Literature.*
Richards, F. J.—*Salem Manual.*
Satischandra Vidyabhushana, Dr.—*History of Indian Logic.*
Schoff, W. H.—*Periplus of the Erythraean Sea.*
Semple, E. C.—*Influences of the Geographic Environment.*
Smith, Dr. Vincent A.—*Early History of India.*
„ „ *History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon.*
Spingairn—*Literary Criticism in the Renaissance.*
Sturrock, J.—*Manual of South Kanara.*
Sundaram Pillai, Prof.—*The Age of Tirugnanasambandha.*
Thibaut, Dr. G.—Varaha Mihira's *Pancha Siddhantikas.*
Thurston, E.—*Castes and Tribes of Southern India.*
Turnour George—*Mahavamso.*
Whitney, Prof.—*Oriental and Linguistic Studies.*
Wills, Lieut.-Col. Mark—*History of Mysore.*
Yule and Burnell—*Hobson-Jobson.*

(ii) TAMIL WORKS.

I. BASIC WORKS FOR THE TABLES.

Agaṉāṉūṟu.
Kuṟuntogai.
Naṟṟiṇai.
Puṟanāṉūṟu.

II. SECONDARY WORKS.

Pattirrupattu.
Pattuppāṭṭu.

III. OTHER WORKS.

Aiṅkurunūru.
Cilappadikāram.
Iraiyanār Agapporuḷ.
Kaḷavaḻi Nārpadu.
Kaliṅgattupparaṇi.
Kalittogai.
Koṅgudēsarājākkaḷ.
Kuraḷ.
Maṇimēkalai.
Paripāḍal.
Periyapurāṇam.
Tamil Ilakkiya Varalāru.
Tiruvācagam.
Tiruviḷayāḍalpurāṇam.
Tolkāppiyam.
Toṇḍaimaṇḍalacatakam.
Vādavūrpurāṇam.
Vañcimānagar.

(iii) PERIODICALS.

Epigraphia Indica, Vol. II.
Modern Review, 1923.
Travancore Archæological Series.

PRINTED AT THE MADRAS LAW JOURNAL PRESS, MYLAPORE, MADRAS.